NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10c

Royal Oak, Michigan | February 3, 1941 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year

U. S. AID TO NAZIS THROUGH U. S. S. R.

(Story on Page 11)

Aid-to-Britain Is Screen for Moves to Regiment America

(Story on Page 20)

Loan Refused to Lift Depression in Cuba

(Story on Page 10)

A Personal Letter From Father Coughlin

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ UNCLE SAM, BROKER FOR EMPIRE ASSETS ★ COMPLETE LIST OF NEW SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN

Dinner Chat

A Letter From Fr. Coughlin

THIS COMMENTATOR — as are most members of the staff of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine—is fortunate in claiming membership in the League of the Little Flower, established by Father Charles E. Coughlin.

Last week it was my good fortune to receive a letter from him. Although of a private nature, I am moved to make it public, trusting that the readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE will receive the same inspiration from its contents which were mine.

Here is Father Coughlin's letter:

"My Dear Friend:

"In a few days the Lenten season will be upon us—a season of penance and mortification.

"Regretfully, I remind you that the world is being chastened for its many social sins.

"Week by week, the theater of war is expanding. Week by week, its horrors and sufferings are being multiplied.

"God alone knows what the future holds in store for all of us. Of one thing we are certain: This Lent must find each one of us concerned with his or her personal sanctification.

"While our minds are occupied with the sufferings of humanity, I ask you to turn your attention to the suffering Jesus Christ Whom our generation has crucified again in rejecting Him and His principles.

"Thus, I am sending you a copy of the *Stations of the Cross*. It may not be too much for you to read these meditations each day during Lent. (Feb. 26-April12).

"The pictures of the Stations are made from the originals which adorn the walls of the Shrine of the Little Flower.

"And I want you to know that each day during Lent—the entire forty days—a Mass will be said for your intention at the Shrine.

"If it is practical—and I know that you will make it so—will you please try to enroll five more members in the League before Lent so that they may join in this crusade of prayer and share in these daily Masses which are being offered in addition to the regular benefits?

"God bless you and your loved ones. And may the wounds suffered by the Sacred Heart of Jesus be partially atoned for by your sacrifices and mortifications.

"Cordially yours in the
Little Flower,
"Chas. E. Coughlin.

"P. S.: To every friend who obtains three memberships to the League in reply to this letter, I will send a leather-bound copy of Father Stedman's *"My Sunday Missal"* (352 pages)."

* * *

Needless to say, I answered our Reverend Friend's good letter and enrolled in the League the seven members of my own family—some living, some dead.

And, to my surprise, this week I was the glad recipient of a prompt answer which informs me that my intentions—and those of my wife and children—will be remembered every day during Lent in a special Mass offered at the Shrine of the Little Flower.

Call this sentimentalism if you like. To me this whole incident strikes a harmonious chord of hope sounding amidst the discordant janglings of hate and despair.

And the comment? It is this: Who knows but, through our combined efforts and prayers, we may be able to extract a few thorns from Christ's brow and add a few jewels to our own everlasting crown.

Who knows but the eloquent silence of our beloved Friend and Teacher will be more persuasive to the legions of his followers now enrolling in the League of the Little Flower!

Possibly you, too, will react as we did when you read this personal letter from Father Coughlin.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.

Just living annual wage.

Nationalization of important public resources.

Private ownership of all other property.

Control of private property for public good.

Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.

Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.

Cost of living maintained on an even keel.

Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

Labor's right to organize.

Recall of non-productive bonds.

Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.

Simplification of Government and lower taxes.

Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.

Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 7 February 3, 1941 No. 5

Wars Are Planned

YOUR letters are a constant encouragement. For this week's recommended reading we nominate the following letter, typical of scores in a similar vein:

TO THE EDITOR:

True, peace-loving Americans are living through these days as though in a nightmare. The step-by-step method toward war is steadily proceeding. Now we find the *Johnson Act* coming up for probable repeal.

Amid all this present-day pro-war propaganda and its resultant hysteria, many seem to forget precisely why the *Johnson Act* was made law. Technically, to safeguard this country and its people and their interests against a possible repetition of the 1917 situation.

Should the *Johnson Act* be repealed, war will be a certainty.

Defense is progressing, aid to Britain, China and Greece is ever increasing. So are taxes.

Frankly, one is led to believe that *modern wars are planned, long in advance of their occurrence, by those who stand to profit, by those in power.* The common people—in a democracy or other government—are the eternal dupes and pawns in the appalling game of death and blood profits.

In a sense, they themselves are to blame, due to inertia, negligence, etc.

Today, talk of peace is shamelessly decried by the interventionists, propagandists and certain misguided elements.

In God's name, wake up, liberty and peace-loving Americans.

— M.J.K.

College Point, N. Y.

Pete Has Another Worry— Rounds Up a New Sekratary

HELLO, FOLKS:

Well, here's me again. I didn't know f'r shure whether'r not I'd be seein' y' all this week 'r f'r quite a few t' follow, so I'm feelin' quite happy 'bout bein' here. I hope th' happiness is mutchul.

Yep, I had quite a skare f'r a day'r so—that "worry" I menshuned las' week, y'know—well, like mos' worries—if y' worry hard enuf—it didn't materialize 'n so here I be. 'N I'm gonna keep right on comin' t' see y' even if my sekratary does up 'n leeve me f'r a month 'r so.

She'll hafta get up early in th' mornin' (which she doesn't, I happen t' know) t' get ahead uv me, I'll tell y'. She kinda thought she had me caught, but I fooled her.

I desided that even if she did go away I'd not give up my littul visit with you folks each week—I've grown so usta chattin' with y' that t' give it up now'd justa 'bout break my hart—so I skouted 'round t' each desk at th' offuce t' find myself a new sekratary 'n I did finully get one that c'd unnerstand my langwige quite well n' so f'r a few weeks y'll see a littul diffrence, p'rhaps.

But don't get 'cited—even though th' spellin' might be a littul worse—'r a littul better—it'll still be y'r own Pete comin' in ev'ry Monday mornin' t' see you.

I haven't tried out my new sekratary yet, but I plan to do that right away so she'll unnerstand my wig-wag sistum 'n line uv chatter. So y' see, I'll be a busy boy with my reorganizin' 'n stuff 'n things.

Well, 'sides my own persunal change, we're havin' annuther. D'y wanna guess what it is? Well, I'll give y' three guesses 'n I'll bet y're right on ev'ry one uv 'em. Yep, y're korrekt — we're movin' — again. We shure do get around, I'll tell th' world.

I haven't seen th' new kwarters yet, but I unnerstand they're right in th' hart uv Royal Oak—not out in th' kountry like we are now. Gee! It won't be kwite as nice. We won't have our pretty trees 'n flowers 'n our birds 'n skwurrls t' look at, but th' girls that hafta carry their lunches 're glad we're movin' in near some restrunts f'r a change. I guess that is an item t' konsider, after all.

* * *

My lates' news 'bout Bob Antwis is that he is holdin' his own. He gave his fam'ly a cuppla good skares, though, but if nothin' further develups he'll be his ol' self in a month'r two. He isn't allowed t' have enny kompny yet so I can't give y' enny first-hand infirmashun. Maybe in a week'r so my sekratary—my new one—c'n go over 'n see him 'n give y' th' dope on his kondishun.

Well, I guess I'll be gettin' along. My presunt sekratary ses she hasta get at a few odds 'n ends 'n clear 'em up 'fore she leeves f'r th' Sunny South, 'n wether I like it 'r not, she has no more time f'r me t'day.

Th' ol' meenie refuses t' take me along with her.

Well, such is life! So we take it as we find it 'n be glad it's as good's it is, eh?

S'long, folks. See y' nex' week as per skedjule!

— Pete.

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name_____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

United States Versus Great Britain

DAY BY DAY more persons are beginning to suspect that the advertised American "all aid for Britain" lacks substance.

In plainer language, critics are asking the question:

"Is this American all-aid-for-Britain, more or less, window dressing?"

The daily press informs us of promises and predictions made by Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Hull, Mr. Knudsen and a score of lesser executives. These promises and predictions, related to the export of airplanes, munitions, ships and other instruments of war, are not being translated into actualities as rapidly as some persons are led to believe.

San Diego, California, is rife with rumors of strife in the airplane industry.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is the scene of an Allis-Chalmers shutdown affecting $26-million worth of Army and Navy defense orders.

Flint, Michigan, hears rumblings of labor discontent.

In a word, all is not harmony on the labor front. As a result our "all aid for Britain" program is still in the promissory state.

Meanwhile, Mr. Knudsen (who will be blamed personally if the "all aid" program bogs down) is sanguine that the production in the automobile and aircraft industries will get under way by April. By that time, according to the most recent estimate, these industries will have finished the re-tooling of plants and factories.

Mr. Knudsen, however, definitely stated that the aircraft production in America cannot reach 35,000 units a year before July of 1942. And this estimate is based on last month's production, which was 799 planes, 60 per cent of which were bombers and fighters and the remainder training ships.

Moreover, Mr. Knudsen said that the United States will not be fully equipped for an army of 1,200,000 and heavy equipment for 800,000 more until the end of 1942 — 23 months distant.

Incidentally, the Axis line of production has gone beyond the promissory state. It is actually functioning.

Unofficial Britishers resident in the country are caustic in criticizing the New Deal's "promissory program," as they designate it.

By 1942, according to them, the war will have been won or lost. In fact, few of them — and they are men formerly interested in British production — entertain any optimism that the war will continue in England beyond the Summer of 1941.

* * *

It is generally rumored that Mr. Harry Hopkins — President Roosevelt's special envoy to England — is exploring the industrial and labor conditions, together with the morale of the common people. Just prior to Hopkin's arrival in England, Mr. Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor, exercised his authority to speed up production. As yet, he has not used his entire power to stamp out strikes and week-end holidays.

A group of laborers estimated at 1½-million sent 1,600 representatives to a meeting near London recently to argue in behalf of a negotiated peace.

More than one of these representatives voiced the opinion that America's "all aid for Britain" program is more notable for its promises than for its performances. This spirit of distrust for America — the first-World-War-"Uncle Shylock" spirit — is gaining ground in England.

As a more specific indication of the growing suspicion of the United States in Britain we print this excerpt from a United Press London dispatch (Jan. 16):

"The Ministry of Economic Warfare said last night that British information tends to confirm, in part, recent assertions that in some ways the United States still is aiding the Axis powers.

"The Ministry hastened to add, however, that British authorities believe such help is not deliberate.

"In this connection, it was understood that Britain had renewed representations to Washington regarding United States shipments to Vladivostok, Russia.

" 'Some United States producers are helping Germany indirectly by selling Russia commodities in which Germany is deficient,' the Ministry said. 'Of these, cotton is the most important. British figures show that between Oct. 15 and Dec. 15, 1940, Russia imported more cotton from the United States than she usually imports from all sources during a full year. In 1940, Russia exported to Germany 100,000 tons of cotton in accordance with the Soviet-German trade agreement.' "

Index to Comment

Dinner Chat: A Letter From Father Coughlin ..... Page 2

United States Versus Great Britain ..... Page 3

British Disregard Neutrality Zone; Veterans of Foreign Wars ..... Page 4

Mr. Garner Goes Home; Concentration Camps—American and German ..... Page 5

Editorials ..... Page 6

Fixing the War Blame; Renegade Rally; PM — Post-Mortem; No Pussyfooter; 'Persecuting' Browder ..... Page 7

U. S. Planes to Singapore; Germans in Paris; Churchill Lets Cat Out ..... Page 8

British Assets; Uncle Sam, Broker; British Officer Praises Hitler; Labor Press Skeptical ..... Page 9

Danger in Cuba ..... Page 10

Behind the War: What About Red Russia? ..... Page 11

O'Mahoney Blames War on Capitalism ..... Page 12

Samuel Dickstein vs. Martin Dies; Detroit Jewish Chronicle; Capitalism, the Bunk! ..... Page 13

Msgr. Smith; Mr. Voorhis Sponsors Monetary Reform ..... Page 16

The Lease-Lend Bill ..... Page 20

When Washington was confronted with this charge, the State Department simply declined to comment!

* * *

Mr. Hull's recent gesture to Soviet Russia is a straw in the wind. While the Secretary of State lifted the "moral embargo" on airplanes and other items going from America to Russia, he did not actually lift the physical embargo.

Nevertheless, the principle has been reaffirmed, namely, that the United States and Red Russia are on friendliest terms — friendly as far as the American Government is concerned at least for things material.

And President Roosevelt's exclusion of Josef Stalin's name from the litany of dictators is a second straw in the wind which indicates that, come what may, our Government does not plan to war against Red Marxism as long as there is hope that the forces of the Soviet Union may be employed against the forces of Brown Marxism.

Most informed Europeans realize that the Moscow and Berlin governments are united in their common fight against modern capitalism. Publicized pacts exist between the two of them. Unpublicized treaties, in all probability, also have been signed by Molotov and Von Ribbentrop.

Both the Hull embargo incident and the Roosevelt dictator speech can be interpreted as an effort on the part of our Government as anchors-to-leaward diplomacy on the basis that the wind will definitely change in favor of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin.

* * *

It is fatuous, furthermore, for any practical person to conclude that Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the resigned Ambassador to London, is at odds with Mr. Roosevelt.

Behind their sham-battling is a solid unanimity. Mr. Kennedy wants all aid for Britain short of war, which is tantamount to having his cake and eating it too.

Both the President and the resigned Ambassador are determined not to get into Britain's war — unless Germany makes war on the United States. And this is not probable unless Chancellor Hitler and his advisers lose all sense of values.

Both the President and the resigned Ambassador recognize the modern democratic tendency of class rule which is taking form in the ranks of labor.

Fearful lest this tendency so increase as to get out of governmental hands, it is not impossible that the "all aid for Britain" program is merely a means of harnessing labor and a method for cashiering democracy in favor of the presidential lend-lease bill through which a strong central authority, akin to dictatorship, will be established in America.

Mr. Kennedy stressed the necessity of central authority. He did not mention the dangers which the Administration see in the ranks of resurgent labor — dangers which are not publicized in the press releases but which are spoken of on the fringes of the inner circles at Washington.

All in all, there are signs that our Government is retreating from its original well-intentioned "all aid to Britain" program, and this retreat is being forced upon the Government by the inherent weakness in England, by the dominant strength in Germany, by the unrest in American labor ranks, and by the urgency on the part of the Government to subdue Congress and

(Continued on Page 4)

Comment

(Continued from Page 3)

the democratic individualism which many Washingtonians are considering to be a menace to America.

* * *

It is interesting to note that Bernard M. Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board in 1918, made a statement (Dec. 19, 1940) on the problems of industrial mobilization. According to the *New York Herald Tribune* he advocated that all defense activities should be fitted together so that "every necessary power is centralized in the President, so that he can give his orders as to policy and have the various agencies execute or carry them out."

Mr. Baruch definitely is on the inside of the Washington program.

And this same gentleman said: "All resources must be mobilized so as to be tapped at will with as much speed as possible . . . This means an organization for each commodity and facility, as in the War Industries Board . . . On the other side of the table will sit representatives of production; i. e., industry. To them will be given allocations or priorities and prices. To them will be addressed questions of increasing production, of lessening demands . . ."

While Mr. Baruch admits that this is not according to the processes of democracy, he maintains that, following the war, all our liberties will be restored.

Incidentally, if logic serves us in interpreting his statement, Mr. Baruch is of the opinion that we must go totalitarian — at least temporarily—to fight totalitarianism.

British Disregard Neutrality Zone

A FORTNIGHT ago the French ship, *Mendoza*, sailed from the harbor of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, intending to seek port in France.

The captain of the vessel carefully steamed his course inside the Brazilian neutrality zone — the three-mile limit.

For many hours — and to the discomfiture of the British warship, *Asturias* — this carefully planned course was maintained.

Fearful lest this war prize, the *Mendoza*, would escape in the darkness of night, the *Asturias* crossed into the neutrality zone and seized the French ship.

At first it was advertised that the *Mendoza*, driven by the winds, had proceeded beyond the three-mile limit to become a legitimate prey.

That was British advertising.

Now, (Jan. 22) word comes from Rio de Janeiro (Associated Press) that Brazil has asked the Panama government to consult with other American Republics to determine whether they desire to protest jointly to Great Britain against illegitimate seizure of the French ship which did not proceed beyond the three-mile limit of the neutrality zone.

The entire incident not only manifests the disregard that belligerent Britain has for neutrality zones, but the clumsiness of the British officials responsible for this *faux pas*.

Already South American papers are playing up the incident to the detriment of London and to the inevitable favor of Berlin.

Who knows but what this *Mendoza* incident will prove, in great part, to be the undoing of much British influence in South America?

It is noteworthy that this story, which appeared in some first editions of our American papers, was killed in later editions.

Its publication, according to one newspaper editor, would contribute much to "submarine the flimsy ship of British propaganda."

Veterans of Foreign Wars

ON PAGES 13 and 14 of a pamphlet called "Fifth Column Facts," published ostensibly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States from their National Headquarters in Kansas City, Missouri, and widely distributed, we read the following:

"There is Father Charles E. Coughlin of Royal Oak, Michigan, some of whose utterances on the radio and elsewhere have been traced back word for word to the outpourings of Germany's Goebbels. His cunning attacks on the Jews, and his support of Fascist methods, have brought the 'Radio Priest' hearty praise from the controlled German press.

"Father Coughlin's anti-democratic, anti-Semitic, pro-Fascist 'line' is already well known to the American people. His incitement to violence, less familiar but no less emphatic, is reflected in SOCIAL JUSTICE, the Coughlin paper.

"Recently, during the period when he was listed as 'editorial counsel,' an editorial titled 'How Much Do You Care?' declared: 'For *10 years* this country has suffered under a depression. It was not an accident. It was *deliberately created* . . . That depression robbed you of your bank savings account, then your jobs and, in many cases, your homes — *and nobody in all America shot a banker!* We continue without jobs, 12 million of us; 22 million subsist on dole rations — *and we do not revolt!* . . . HOW MUCH WILL WE STAND?'

"Father Coughlin's program, as set down in SOCIAL JUSTICE, is filled with promises to every group. He pledges high prices to the farmer, low prices to the consumer. He promises capital security against 'Communists,' his synonym for labor unions. He promises labor security against exploitation. He promises freedom of the press, except for those opposed to the Government. His ideal government is the Corporate State."

* * *

Now, the author of these statements is so "soldierly" that he hides his identity behind the great coat of the Veterans of Foreign Wars — if, indeed, the booklet is at all the genuine product of that organization.

The author is one of those individuals, evidently, who is afraid to speak for himself; afraid to show himself. Probably, for a very good reason.

Preferably, he finds it easier to spread his lies, innuendos and unsubstantiated statements through the funnel of the Foreign War Veterans.

When was Father Coughlin "anti-Democratic"? The unknown author cannot prove it by word and page.

When was Father Coughlin "anti-Semitic"? The unknown author cannot prove it by word and page.

When was Father Coughlin "pro-Fascist"? The unknown author cannot prove it by word and page.

When did Father Coughlin incite citizens to violence? The unknown author cannot prove it by word and page!

* * *

Of course, Mr. Anonymous can quote similar falsified reports from certain "controlled" journals, supplied from the same sources, some of whom go so far even as to have had *Father Coughlin in jail for the last several months!*

But this "hider-behind-the-Veterans-of-Foreign-Wars" cloak cannot prove, from any of Father Coughlin's writings or statements, any one of the intolerant charges which he makes.

Naturally, no one expects Father Coughlin to come forward and disprove these charges. The rules of logic, and court procedure in this enlightened country, demand that he who makes the charges must prove that his charges are true.

Decent citizens, everywhere, remember that it was Father Coughlin's voice and work — *more than the voice and work of any other individual* — that got the Soldiers' Bonus for the veterans following the first World War.

The bonus was vetoed by Mr. Roosevelt, but carried through Congress successfully over the President's veto — due to the overwhelming number of telegrams and letters which the Radio Priest's voice caused to avalanche upon Washington.

Many members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have written to Father Coughlin, and to the editors of this National Magazine, to ask if the V.F.W. booklet is "genuine"; who the author of the article is; what basis there is in fact for his charges against Father Coughlin; and where the information came from, etc., etc.

We are referring all such inquirers to the National Headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Kansas City.

To their credit be it said, that almost without exception, every veteran's letter paid the tribute of grateful acknowledgment to Father Coughlin for his efforts in getting the veterans their bonus after it had been vetoed by President Roosevelt.

Publication of an anonymous pamphlet making unsupported charges is not enough. Who sponsors these scandalous charges? If the Veterans of Foreign Wars then let them go on and prove one of them.

We strongly suspect that the mysterious authorship can be traced to the same *clique* that is putting out all the rest of the anti-Coughlin, anti-Catholic, anti-Christian charges for anybody who will publish them. And the headquarters for one of these notorious "smear-gangsters" is Kansas City, Missouri!

Come on now, boys, let us know who this Mr. Anonymous is!

The friends of SOCIAL JUSTICE want to see his picture and learn his name.

Our suspicion is that he will run to cover and plead with the publishers of his lying composition to hide him under the bed (a feather bed preferred), until he is needed again to smear some other innocent American.

Comment

Mr. Garner Goes Home

"RESOLVED: That the Senate express its appreciation of the courtesy, fairness, impartiality and ability shown by the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, Hon. John N. Garner, in the administration of the duties of his office during the past eight years and tender him its sincere thanks."

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Upper House while the Senators waited for the Presidential party to reach the Capitol for Mr. Roosevelt's third inauguration.

Tribute was paid to Mr. Garner for his 38 years of service in Congress, first as Representative for 30 years, the latter two as Speaker of the House, and the last eight years as Vice President.

Mr. Garner took leave of the President and Mrs. Roosevelt and Vice President and Mrs. Wallace on the inauguration platform, declining the President's invitation to attend the White House reception.

"This is the end of my official life here and now," said Mr. Garner, "I want to cut it out here."

Cecil Dickson, an International News staff writer, describes the leave taking:

"The President embraced Garner with one free arm and the white-haired Texan, tears in his eyes, affectionately put his arms around the Chief Executive. As they broke, Garner planted a quick kiss and said, 'This is good-bye and good luck, Chief.'

He told Vice President Wallace he was going to "use your office for a while 'til my train time," adding that "you can't be in two places at once anyway." Garner went to his old office in the Senate Building and took a two-hour nap.

A number of old Senate and House cronies and newspapermen greeted him when he awoke. He held a sort of an informal reception and told his guests to "strike a blow for liberty," pointing to Scotch and Bourbon on his wash basin. They did.

"Garner was in a good mood," Dickson's story says. "He put on a light-colored Western hat given him by his old friend, Amon G. Carter, Fort Worth publisher, and said, 'Dude hats for me are a thing of the past.'

At the President's invitation, Garner had accompanied him to religious services at St. John's Episcopal Church before accompanying the inauguration party to the Capitol. He wore a tall silk hat borrowed from his Texas friend, Bascom Timmons, newspaper correspondent.

"I almost lost it three times," Garner said. "Once in church, again in the car and the last time on the rostrum. It was too small, I didn't have one, but I made out with Timmons'. Anyway, Jesse Jones (Secretary of Commerce) had been wearing it for five years and the only way Timmons could get it back was to tell Jesse he wanted it for me.

"I want about a year of rest, but I don't know whether I can get it," Garner said. "I've got enough for Mrs. Garner and me to live on for the rest of our lives and I intend to live till I'm 93 years old. That's 21 to go.

"I'm going to ride horseback, go fishing and tend to my business. I always live in the future."

Laughing, Garner said, "When the revolution comes, they'll get you boys up here before they get me down in Texas — that's a long way to go."

Concentration Camps— American and German

IN THE Saturday, January 11th, edition of the *Detroit Free Press* there was published a story headlined "Parolee of Texas Describes Killing Tortures in Prison."

It was one of those stories which—*nolens volens*—produces a morbid, mustifying effect in the reader's mind.

The thought occurred to this commentator that, probably, the story will be reprinted in the German press—with a plenitude of journalistic embroidery surrounding it.

And the question was asked: "What will the German press say about the atrocities in American concentration camps — the same America which takes delight in publicizing 'atrocities' in German concentration camps?"

Here is the *Free Press* story:

"In the Wayne County jail there is a 43-year-old prisoner who hopes that some Texas officials will take that philanthropist's offer of $50 for every lash of a prison whip they can endure.

"To many it was just a gesture on the part of a kindly man to focus attention on brutality in the Texas penal system, but to James Gillespie, whose dark hair is streaked with gray, it is the hope for an end to something so terrible as to be unbelievable—a brutality that sees men go into a Texas prison for a short term and turn murderers under days and nights of unending cruelty.

"Gillespie knows. Last March he emerged from 12 years in the Texas Huntsville Prison. His voice breaks with emotion when he tries to tell of men lashed to death in the cotton fields, of packs of dogs that tear prisoners to shreds and of such ingenious tortures as 'barrel standing.'

"A steeplejack, Gillespie fell and fractured his spine. When he came out of the hospital, penniless, his wife had tuberculosis. He tried a holdup and got $1.25 and 12 years in prison. He went in on June 11, 1928.

"He went to Huntsville Prison, a center for 19 scattered camps. Just out of the hospital, he was sent to Harlen Farm No. 1 to hoe cotton.

" 'You get up in the dark,' he said, 'and then it's four miles to the field at a pert walk, which, in plain English, is a run. You work in squads of 10 to 16. There's a guard on horseback with each squad. He carries a shotgun, pistol and a wet rope with knots in it. You're at the field by dawn. You work till dark. Each man has a row and the fastest picker or hoer sets the pace. You've got to keep up.

" 'When you fall behind, the guard turns his pistol over to another guard and lashes you with the knotted rope or a hoe handle. I've seen men beaten to death with a hoe handle because they couldn't keep up.'

"A dog sergeant, with a pack of 12 dogs, is assigned to each four squads of prisoners. It was the dog sergeant who kicked Gillespie in the mouth when he couldn't keep up. Gillespie was unconscious from 2:30 p. m. until 9 a. m. the next day. They put him in a hospital then and he came out 40 pounds lighter.

" 'No matter what a man's term, the constant cruelty keeps him ready for an escape,' Gillespie said. He made one break and got to South Bend, Ind. He was captured and got 113 days in solitary with one meal every 36 hours.

"Then they sent him to a retrieve farm, the worst of all the camps, for six years.

" 'Each squad had to pick 200 pounds of cotton a day,' he said. 'If at the end of the month you hadn't met the average every day, every man in the squad was taken out and given 20 lashes.'

"It was here that Gillespie met the barrel treatment. A vinegar barrel was inverted and the prisoner was ordered to stand on top of it—three hours on and off, all night long.

" 'I stood on it five nights straight and always the next morning had to go to work without sleep,' Gillespie recounted. 'It was for failure to keep up, and I never could under that.'

"One day three men working near a woods 'cut and run.' The dogs were sent after them. The guards found one man with his hands up and shot him to death. The other two were cornered and ordered to fight the dogs or be shot. 'They were so badly chewed,' Gillespie recalled, that both died.

" 'At Eastern Farm, "Little Alcatraz," ' Gillespie recalled, 'a convict stabbed a guard. Nine men in his squad, in panic, cut for the woods. One turned back. He was shot and killed. In the next hours, the guards or the dogs killed the other eight.'

"Gillespie got out of Huntsville in October and came to Detroit to see his three children. Here he faces a robbery charge. If convicted, he will have broken his parole, and will face an additional 23 years in a Texas prison."

* * *

Once more we ask:

"What will the German press say about atrocities in American concentration camps —the same America which takes so much delight in publicizing stories about German concentration camps?"

And the moral? Perhaps it would be well for us to mature a policy of "*All aid for America*," rather than continuing to flirt around with a fiction of "All aid for Britain."

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Appeasement to Red Russia

EARLY in his first administration, President Roosevelt mystified the nation by a sudden, overnight, recognition of Soviet Russia.

One of the first actions of his third term is to lift the "moral embargo" on Soviet Russia, imposed December 2, 1939, when the Reds invaded Finland after the rape of East Poland.

On the very day this action was taken, Representative Vinson, Chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, reported that vital work on naval construction was being slowed down by a shortage of machine tools, aluminum products and armaments—of all which we already have been sending to the Soviet.

The lifting of the moral embargo was defended by Administration spokesmen as simply a "friendly gesture," in view of the fact that we can spare relatively few planes now.

As the "Commentator" for the *Detroit News* put it:

"We indicate to Stalin that we regard him no longer as the gent who bombed civilians in Finland, but as the hero who may, perchance some day, bomb them in Germany. We place him among the world's great democrats, like Dictator Metaxas of Greece, and the Lion of Judah. We give him an honorary membership in our club, but if he shows up for a meal, all the tables are taken."

And the same newspaper adds editorially: "The embargo's popularity sprang mainly from the accepted American belief that the Russians were anti-religious, anti-capitalist, conspiratorially hostile to the American form of government and now proved militarily aggressive as well . . .

"The sudden discovery, as of January 21, 1941, that the Russians are not such bad fellows after all, is well calculated to produce a sort of national dizziness."

* * *

Lifting our embargo against Russia might be intelligible from a military or diplomatic standpoint if there were any assurance that supplies to Russia would not immediately travel on through to Germany.

What is the point in talking about all-aid-to-Britain, and then offsetting the little aid we can give Britain by increasing aid to Germany by way of Moscow?

Furthermore, the Roosevelt action comes at the very moment that the British are suppressing Communist publications and the Communist Party, which is complicating the threat of early revolution by the people of England.

As the *New York Daily News* observes: "We take it the President meant what others have said more plainly—that the present war is not just another war, but is at the bottom a revolution, which is spreading farther and farther over the world . . .

"It's quite a situation," the *News* adds, "to find ourselves *for* one revolution and *forninst* another revolution at the same time.

"It would become an even more interesting situation if the two revolutions *should turn out to be somehow intertwined at the bottom.*"

As SOCIAL JUSTICE says frankly elsewhere in this issue, this aid-to-Britain business is, in effect, a smoke-screen for the swifter moves toward totalitarian dictatorship in our own country.

And when you came to factual realities, instead of propagandist names for things, what IS the difference between the dictatorships of Red Marxism, Brown Socialism or "Red-White-and-Blue" collectivism?

You tell us—the coloration, perhaps!

WHEN an attendant at the third Roosevelt inaugural dropped the Holy Bible, some sensitive and superstitious observers were reminded of the famous cartoon, "Dropping the Pilot," inspired by the then "young Kaiser's decision to dispense with the counsel of the veteran Bismarck.

A Right of Citizenship

FREE SPEECH is the right of citizens; refugee "guests" in this country enjoy it only as a privilege which they may not abuse.

The famous founder of the *Saturday Evening Post,* and his illustrious successors, would, we believe, applaud this forthright editorial utterance in the current (Jan. 25) *Post.*

"What Cardinal O'Connell calls 'exalted hysteria,' burned high at Mecca Temple, in New York," the *Post* reports. "The 'wick' was Clarence K. Streit's *Union Now,* which at first was propaganda for a Confederation of Western 'democracies' and turns out to mean simply Anglo-American union.

"There are Americans who have an expatriate passion for it. Somerset Maugham was there. As a British subject, serving his government here, he was for it. He had been converted. How astonishing!

"Henri Bernstein, the French playwright, was there. He denounced American isolationists, says the *New York Times,* every one of them as a 'masked appeaser.'

"Mr. Bernstein we understand, *is a guest in this country* because it is safer and more comfortable here than anywhere else in the world, thanks to a century and a half of American isolation.

"We would like to remind him," the *Post* editorial adds, "that freedom of speech *is a right that belongs only to an American citizen.*

"To a *guest* it is a privilege, and may be very easily abused.

"And we say the same to all the eminent literary persons who presume upon the amenities of their social welcome to be acting among us as foreign agents and propagandists, besides having the bad manners to tell us how we ought to think and feel and behave."

That, we believe, is a sound American viewpoint.

There is far too much talk about helping this deserving foreign cause or that; about condemnations of this or that foreign aggression—and far too little talk, or thought, about this grand country of America, from the standpoint of what is good for America and Americans.

Natives of Horta, in the Azores, jubilantly received Wendell Willkie under the mistaken impression that he was the President of the United States.

Having heard his comments on Administration foreign policy, it is understandable how they WOULD be confused.

Comment

Fixing War Blame

IN HIS January 16th syndicated article, Mr. Westbrook Pegler said:

"It must amuse the Communists and the Nazis to observe the squirming of the American people in a desperate struggle to escape Communism or Naziism, which are pretty much the same.

"The more we wiggle and writhe the tighter our bonds are drawn like the cords enmeshing the victim of a ribald prank known as the sack trick which the bootleggers sometimes practiced on their friends in the days of prohibition."

He added: "In a very short time now opinion in the press will be curbed in the interests of the great national effort to preserve freedom of speech, thought and writing, for already the feeling is on the rise that criticism of the President or resistance to his plans is obstructive and wrong."

Twenty years hence, when it will be possible to analyze the causes of this war, it may be ascertained that *a small group — powerful, unconscionable, relentless and clever — influenced our Government to participate in this war simply to satisfy the hate its leaders have for Hitler.*

And the propaganda concerning democracy then will be unveiled.

Too late? No.

The deceived Americans of that generation, lacking religious leadership and restraint, will turn upon the betrayers of America!

Renegade Rally

THE renegade group known as *Union Now* took over the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City last week to hold a mass meeting which urged the abolition of American independence and the return of the United States to colonial status within the British Empire.

Such a proposal is treasonable at any time, but when made in a time of world war, for the express purpose of getting the United States into the European conflict through the back door, it brands its supporters not only as traitors but outright foreign enemy agents.

Nevertheless, some 2,000 members of New York's upper crust attended the function and applauded vigorously when Clarence Streit, *Union Now* chieftain, called for a "provisional emergency union" immediately with the British Empire while a convention meets to thrash out a permanent constitution.

Other speakers were Miss Dorothy Thompson, columnist; Clare Boothe, wife of *Time* tycoon Henry Luce; Andre Giraud, French columnist who now lives regally in New York while his countrymen starve; Thomas Mann, German refugee and specialist in writing novels and short stories about homosexuals, tuberculars and cripples; and finally, Lord Marley, radical British leftist who has lectured all over the world on behalf of Zionism and who was banned from Japan in 1933 because of his Communist sympathies.

Only in America could such a meeting take place. Only in America could the traitorous speeches have been nationally broadcast and widely printed next day in the national press.

The same day another renegade faction, ironically called "The Pilgrims of the United States," met in the Hotel Biltmore a few blocks away and heard a pro-war pep talk from its president, Nicholas Murray Butler, who recently abolished academic freedom in Columbia University "for the duration."

A veteran war-monger, Dr. Butler urged our intervention in the World War just as he is now for our intervention in this one.

"America must embark on a new crusade for liberalism," Dr. Butler told his listeners.

The aged college president has changed only one word in his war slogan in the last 24 years. In 1917 he called it a "crusade for democracy."

The Pilgrims' meeting, appropriately, opened with a toast to President Roosevelt and King George VI of Great Britain.

PM: Post-Mortem

THE New York tabloid, *PM*, which tried to pick up the Communist party line dropped by Stalin after his pact with Hitler, already has one foot in the journalistic graveyard.

Two weeks ago, the paper cut its three daily editions down to one and thereby renounced all hope of competing in "spot" news coverage with New York's four other afternoon newspapers.

No longer a newspaper, *PM* remains little but a daily news commentary, or — to put it more bluntly — a leftist, atheistic, pro-war daily propaganda digest.

PM has already gone through one financial reorganization, a few months ago when Marshall Field, department store millionaire, bought out the original investors.

How much longer the venture will last is anybody's guess.

Employes predict the paper will expire completely around the end of March.

PM's editors and financial backers have finally learned that they can't sell war to the masses at five cents a copy.

No Pussyfooter

IF ANY American still doubts that the Administration intends to keep out of war, let him reflect on the appointment of Senator Carter Glass of Virginia to a seat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Ever since 1933 Senator Glass has openly advocated a combined assault of the United States and the other "democracies" to crush Hitler; and, for the last six months, he has been demanding that the United States armed forces be sent over to Europe "to wipe Hitler off the map."

In the face of such professions of sentiment, on January 17 Senator Glass was made a member of the body whose duty it is to help set the course of American foreign policy. The appointment was announced by the Senate Steering Committee after a conference with President Roosevelt.

On January 18, one day after Glass had been selected, the 83-year-old Virginian publicly declared that "the United States should declare war on Germany at once." He added, "I should like to see Hitler at the bottom of the sea."

There is this to say about Carter Glass. He is not a hypocrite.

The rest of them, every bit the Hitler-haters that Glass announces himself to be, say that they are going to keep the United States out of war but destroy Hitler by helping the British Empire's war.

At least, Mr. Glass says what he *means!*

'Persecuting' Mr. Browder

TOSSING technicalities about in the manner of a circus juggler who keeps five Indian clubs in the air simultaneously, defense counsel for Earl Browder argued before the United States Supreme Court that America's No. 1 Communist is being "persecuted."

Mr. Browder was found guilty of passport forgery and sentenced to four years' imprisonment last January 22 — a year ago — in the United States District Court of New York.

He has remained free on bond, however, pending his appeal in the courts. During the recent presidential campaign — despite his conviction and Federal prison sentence — Browder toured the country and was freely permitted to speak over national radio hook-ups on behalf of his candidacy for President of the United States.

Thus, as spokesman for Josef Stalin, Browder was granted privileges which are denied to Father Coughlin, who preaches Christian social justice. The latter topic has been defined by the radio monopoly as "controversial," hence not a permissable subject for public radio discussion.

Carl S. Stern, chief defense attorney for Browder, told the Supreme Court that the Government is merely hounding poor, innocent Mr. Browder because he happens to be the leader of the American Communist Party, whose views are "unpopular" with conservative Americans.

Mr. Stern asserted, among other things, that the 1917 *Espionage Act* under which Browder was convicted does not apply to his offense; that the *Statute of Limitations* precludes his prosecution now; that there was no willful intent to violate any law; and lastly, that there was no violation of law.

Conviction hinged upon the fact, glossed over by the defense in its argument, that Browder used a passport which had been fraudulently obtained. In applying for it he made the untrue statement that he had not at any previous time been issued a passport.

Nevertheless, it is known by the Government, and admitted by the defense, that Browder on at least three occasions had obtained passports under assumed names.

Mr. Browder is admittedly the agent of Josef Stalin, whose Communist Party of the United States seeks to establish here the international Marxian form of government existing in the godless Soviet.

It is, therefore, ironic that Browder and other Communists appeal for protection to the courts, the United States laws, and the *Constitution* which the Communist Party works to destroy.

Comment

U. S. Planes to Singapore

TO PREPARE for any eventuality in the Far East the British government is shipping nearly 200 powerful American-built fighting planes to Singapore.

The British fear that, concomitant with a German drive through the Balkans, the Japanese and Siamese will launch a drive on French Indo-China, with Malaysia as the goal.

Britain has already prepared for the attack by sharing naval bases in Singapore and Borneo with the United States.

Through the Anglo-Australian-American defense agreement, this country has pledged to resist Japanese attack in the Far East.

The proximate preparation for the attack was the division of America's one-ocean Navy into three fleets — Atlantic, Pacific and Asiatic.

This was no "miraculous" multiplication of fishes or ships—despite the division, the United States still has a one-ocean Navy. But it will undertake to operate in three oceans!

* * *

British diplomats say that the diversion of such a great number of fighting planes to the big military and naval base in the Straits Settlement is only a "routine replacement" of fighting aircraft in that area. But the fact remains that the additional planes are sorely needed in the defense of the Empire.

In accord with a previous arrangement, Thailand proceeded to serve demands on French Indo-China for the restoration of former Siamese territory—territory which would provide a corridor for attack against Singapore.

The airplanes, shipped to Singapore with the approval of the American Government, are late model Brewster pursuit ships, carry heavy armor and four machine guns, and are capable of a top speed of 350 miles per hour.

Thus America, at the risk of our own lagging national defense, provides Britain with airplanes, not only for the defense of England, but also for the defense of the British Empire life-line in far off Asia.

While Americans are complaining about the inadequate production of fuselages, motors, armor and aeronautical equipment necessary for the defense of this hemisphere, our administration permits the shipment of 200 new planes to the British empire at Singapore.

Of course all of this is in line with the private, consolidated American and British course of action to preserve the *status quo* in the Orient, as well as in Europe—even though to do so might seriously undermine America's own preparations for an adequate self-defense.

American secret agreements and commitments are becoming manifest in public actions and the policies resulting from these agreements.

Americans will know the full fateful extent of these secret agreements and pacts only when everything which was promised has been fulfilled—and perhaps in actual warfare for mutual assistance.

Germans in Paris

SOME WEEKS ago there appeared in the newspapers a dispatch reporting that Nazi soldiers had "massacred scores of French students in an Armistice Day uprising in Paris."

The reported source of this published information was *a European refugee* recently arrived in America.

In New York last week, an Associated Press correspondent, Roy P. Porter, labeled this news report as a most exaggerated canard.

"French and German sources in Paris," he wrote, "supported by neutral eye-witnesses including myself, are agreed that there is no evidence of any student being shot or killed."

In an editor's note preceding Porter's article, one of a series, it was stated that he is in the United States after observing the German military rule for six months in the occupied area of France.

Mr. Porter may have dispelled many erroneous notions which pro-British propagandists would rather leave uncorrected in the mind of the American public.

The Germans, he reported, are conducting themselves politely and courteously. They are not mistreating French women and children. They are not murdering French men.

On the contrary, he asserted, they are fraternizing with the French, seeking to conciliate them and establish friendship. This course of action, he said, is the order from Berlin.

And, believe it or not, Mr. Porter declared that a German officer or soldier "gives up his seat to French women in the subway trains and busses, often more quickly than his French or American companions."

What! No vandalism? No chopping off children's hands? No horror stories at all?

Apparently, Mr. Porter needs a good, thorough course in propaganda.

How can the Anglophiles expect us to fight the "terrible Huns" when honest reporters like him are telling us what they saw in France?

You simply cannot breed war hatreds on cold facts.

Churchill Lets Cat Out

ALTHOUGH Prime Minister Churchill could not testify before the United States Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committee, his recent address in Glasgow—in the presence of Harry Hopkins, American "ambassador-extraordinary"—was a message to American lawmakers.

It was truly remarkable that Mr. Churchill and his American mouthpieces mentioned ominously and mysteriously the "great crisis" which is supposed to occur in the next 60 or 90 days.

That indefinite threat is the big stick intended to force through the passage of the spend-lend-lease plan of full aid for England.

Unfortunately, Prime Minister Churchill gave away the purpose of the secret mission of Harry Hopkins and the unpublicized visits of "Wild Bill" Donovan to the battleground of Britain.

Hopkins was sent to England to observe conditions at first hand and to report directly, like another Col. House, to the President without recourse even to the State Department.

Like House, Hopkins will return to contradict the testimony and opinions of such persons as may oppose "the plan" on the basis of their own first hand observations.

Churchill, like Daladier, addressed a "final appeal to America" and warned the world that unless aid is forthcoming, Britain, like France, *will withdraw from the strife because of our broken promises and unfulfilled pledges.*

Triple Pass: Morgenthau to Chiang Kai Shek to Stalin

THE Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., was recognized as a "pantywaist" in college days, as far as football was concerned.

Grown to manhood, and having been pushed into the Treasury Department on the basis of friendship — not knowledge — he was thus selected as fullback on the All-American eleven by Captain Quarterback F.D.R.

According to the United Press (Jan. 3) we read that "Final details of a $50-million stabilization agreement between the United States and the Chinese government of General Chiang Kai Shek are expected to be worked out within the next few days . . .

"The proposed agreement, which was discussed at a meeting yesterday between Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and T. V. Soong, head of the Central Bank of China, will be similar to the recent agreement with Argentina.

"Under its terms, the Treasury will set aside $50-million for the purchase of Chinese *yuan* when such action seems necessary to preserve the *yuan's* purchasing power. Any part of this sum, or none at all, may be used."

Translated into the gridiron vernacular, Fullback Morgenthau has thrown a forward pass to Left End Chiang Kai Shek.

Expert in the game of double-dealing, the $100-million forward pass was quickly lateraled into the open arms of Josef Stalin.

How come?

According to the Associated Press (Jan. 13), we read:

"An agreement on the third part of a Chinese-Soviet Russian pact, providing for exchange of Chinese minerals for Russian military machinery and supplies, was reported yesterday by *Sao Tang Jih Pao,* Chinese army newspaper.

"It said the goods exchanged would amount to the equivalent of 100,000,000 United States dollars.

"The second part of the agreement, reported Jan. 3, was said to have involved exchange of Chinese wool for Russian supplies. The first part providing for an exchange of Chinese tea for Russian material was announced Dec. 11."

Of course, Quarterback F.D.R. — like every smart football quarterback — does not advertise his signals and plays either to the enemy or to the 130-million spectators in the grandstand.

Post factum, however, the smart ones amongst the 130-million can analyze plays — and the purposes thereof.

We now begin to understand why Qb. F.D.R. excoriated the aggressors — Hitler and Mussolini specifically. We also begin to understand why he spoke no unkind word against Joe Stalin, the eventual receiver of the triple pass.

Comment

British Assets

WE RECOLLECT that Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, officially reported to a Congressional committee on the precarious state of British assets in America.

Summarized, he led the nation to understand that Britain is "broke"; that she cannot continue paying the cost of the war for more than a few months.

On the same day that Mr. Morgenthau unveiled his gloomy picture, the officers of the Federal Reserve Bank seemingly contradicted the Secretary of the Treasury.

According to the bankers, Britain had almost six times as many assets in America as Mr. Morgenthau indicated.

When these double figures were challenged, it was found out that Mr. Morgenthau's figures referred only to England's assets, while the Federal Reserve figures referred to Britain's assets.

Double figures and double talk lead to confusion.

It must be understood that all Britain, which embraces Canada, South Africa, Australia, etc., is at war against Germany.

This is more than England's war. This is Britain's war.

Britain, with a population of more than ½-billion persons, is broke — but not entirely broke.

Her statesmen confess that her economic system has bogged down.

Her spokesmen — including Mr. Morgenthau — confess that her assets are approaching the vanishing point.

And Britain is desirous of maintaining this economic and financial system.

More than that, Britain's champions in America are willing to scuttle our own economic and financial system to help the Empire on the basis of sending good dollars after bad dollars.

* * *

As a side issue to this comment, we learn that Kuhn Loeb & Co. recently offered over the counter a block of 42,534 shares of Union Pacific Railroad Co. common stock at $84 a share. And this block of stock represented British-owned securities.

Also offered at the close of the market on the same day was a British-owned block of 13,825 shares of H. L. Green Co. common.

This was sold at 33⅞ dollars a share.

Recollecting that the British government — more properly called the English government — commandeered the private holdings of citizens in England, these sales indicate that the English government is dumping securities to obtain American dollars.

There are many other English holdings in the United States. Before the American public should be asked by Mr. Morgenthau or Mr. Roosevelt to make outright gifts to "Britain," as they term it — or "England," as others term it — it is only equitable and just to Americans that all British or English securities in this country should be turned into dollars and spent by England for England.

In past issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE we have indicated some of the British or English holdings in America.

Why should we Americans be suckers, spending our own money and leaving untouched the potential money of the Empire, which, in the first instance, declared this war?

Uncle Sam, Broker

EVER SINCE the late Lord Lothian's speech on the deplorable state of British finances, and the subsequent Congressional demands for an investigation of them, Wall Street banking and brokerage firms have done a brisk business in distributing British-owned American securities.

These holdings are English-held stocks which were confiscated by the British government to help finance the war. The British Purchasing Commission has been forced to liquidate the securities to purchase war materials immediately at the lowest possible prices.

Several large blocks have been quietly and quickly placed with investors throughout the United States.

The only fly in the ointment is the undesirable publicity attached to the sales. The British selling agents would prefer to liquidate the holdings secretly, but the rules of the U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission demand full publicity for the transactions.

While the rules are being observed to a certain extent, the S.E.C., which is supposed to investigate all mysterious securities transactions, has been somewhat negligent in giving the British deals the publicity their importance deserves.

The British would like to dump all their holdings into the United States Government's lap in lieu of a loan. This would mean that the Administration itself would buy the securities and own them outright, for it is no secret now that the British cannot pay for the war and hence could not redeem these securities if they were put up as collateral on a loan.

It is expected that the Administration soon will create an alphabetical agency empowered to buy British securities and sell them to American investors.

The advantage to Britain of this plan is that an estimated $2-billion in English-owned American securities would be liquidated at one fell swoop.

The British Purchasing Commission would not then have to sell in comparatively small dribbles, but would realize immediately $2-billion — or whatever amount the investments really total — in cash for war purchases.

Labor Press Skeptical

THE LABOR press, spokesman for organized American labor, is not deluded by any British propaganda that their empire is fighting "our battle."

A recent poll of labor paper editors is reported by the Federated Press, a labor news service.

According to the *Indianapolis Union*, publication of the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, Indiana, 91 per cent of the labor editors of the United States are opposed to America's entrance into the war "even if England seems to be losing."

"Eighty-four per cent," this paper says, "believe that the war is primarily an effort by England to prevent break-up of its empire by a rival power, while 16 per cent consider it primarily a crusade to crush fascism and reestablish democracy in Europe.

" . . . As in previous polls, the labor press revealed itself in sharp contrast to the views of daily newspaper publishers.

"The almost unanimous sentiment for keeping at peace and the overwhelming skepticism on Britain's objectives are all the more significant because of labor's universal hatred of fascism—a hatred that is not wholly shared by the daily press.

"Comments from a number of editors indicate that the strong anti-interventionist stand of the labor press may be attributed to labor's belief that any alleged crusade to wipe out fascism would open America's door to Fascist customs."

British Officer Praises Hitler

WRITING in the *Chicago Tribune*, Larry Rue, London correspondent, tells a story about a British officer who praised Hitler — and then saw the dawn.

As a matter of fact, many of the things the officer said were true. And his criticism was *apropos*.

However, free expression is not permitted in democratic England in these perilous times of war. The English prefer to imitate the ostrich and have their tail feathers singed by an acetylene torch while they tell themselves that it is nothing more than the rays of the morning sun.

Here is Mr. Rue's dispatch:

"Lieut. Thomas Lonsdale Hilton, a royal naval volunteer reserve officer, was sentenced to be 'severely reprimanded' by a disciplinary court at Great Yarmouth for 'expressing defeatist views liable to cause alarm and despondency among the public.'

"The chief witness, Capt. Robert Soanes, testified he got into conversation with Hilton on a bus Dec. 9. According to Soanes, Hilton said Adolf Hitler was a clever man to have invaded the Low Countries so rapidly. He also spoke of how Hitler sent troops into Norway across 120 miles of water, Soanes said, and asked, 'Where was the British navy that they had not stopped them?'

"Hilton also allegedly declared democratic government was rotten and if Britain did not watch out she would be blockaded. He maintained, Soanes said, that Britain could not build ships fast enough to replace those already sunk.

"Soanes testified that Hilton asserted South Africa was only half heartedly in the war. He quoted Hilton as saying it took the Allies four and a half years to beat Germany in the last war and 'goodness knows how long it will take to beat them without Allies.

"Soanes also informed the court that Hilton complained that the government could find plenty of money for the war, but not for old-age pensioners.

"The captain revealed that when he returned home he wrote down Hilton's remarks and reported them to his superior officer.

"The prosecutor told the court that there could be no doubt Hilton's remarks must be regarded as of a defeatist character and therefore prejudicial to good order and naval discipline."

At Our Own Doorstep

Danger In Cuba

AMERICANS have been hearing a lot about the success of President Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy.

Latin America has heard about it, too, but not always with the adjective. To them this "good neighbor" business is often simply another Yankee diplomatic trick, to be treated with the same distrust and caution as has been meted out to American imperial gestures in the past.

Alone of all Latin Americans, the 4,228,000 inhabitants of Cuba appear to have a genuine affection for the United States.

It is thus all the more fateful for American foreign relations that, at this very moment, the United States is slowly destroying this good-will.

At present antipathy towards the United States is confined to the Cuban upper classes. But the new feeling of dislike is spreading.

The cause of this unfavorable turn of relations between the United States and Cuba is purely economic.

Not only Cuba's welfare and prosperity, but its very existence, depend on the production of sugar — which accounts for 75 per cent of the island's exports.

About 2 million tons of sugar annually go to the United States. Another million tons, however, are sold to Europe — or used to be sold there before this war.

A large part of last year's quota of Cuban sugar for Europe is now rotting in warehouses, as a result of the British sea blockade. All of this year's sugar crop grown for European export seems likely doomed to the same fate.

* * *

Cuban economy managed to weather the financial storm last year by belt-tightening and financial sacrifice. It is extremely doubtful, however, if a similar crisis this year can be met without serious repercussions.

In Cuba, as in most Latin American countries, repercussions mean revolutions and political anarchy.

The Cuban government has recently appealed to Washington for a $50-million loan to tide it through the coming 12 months.

Since Congress had just appropriated half a billion dollars for the Export Import Bank, to counter Nazi infiltration in Latin America, Cubans expected — perhaps with some justice — that their request might be granted.

But when the answer came back from Washington, it was "no."

Government money-lenders, it appeared, preferred to lend money to South American nations, which have been either lukewarm or outright hostile to the United States, rather than to Cuba, which has always been a grateful friend.

* * *

Various explanations have been given the Cubans as to why the money was refused.

One is that the United States "has Cuba under its thumb anyway," and, therefore, does not need to lend it money.

Another is that the financial and economic situation of Cuba is always chaotic, so more money wouldn't help matters.

The reported real reason, disclosed to a few American visitors, is that certain members of the American State Department have "private grievances against some Cuban politicians and are withholding the money until these men are removed from office."

The Cubans, needless to say, are not interested in any of the reasons why the money is not forthcoming.

All they know is that the United States Export Import Bank has $500-million; that the United States has already given part of this largesse to Brazil and other South American countries; but that none of it is to be made available to Cuba.

* * *

Meanwhile the economic depression in Cuba increases day by day. For the past month, the municipal workers in Havana have gone without pay checks. Before the month is out, it is expected that government employes will have to face the same situation.

It is particularly annoying to Cubans that this condition should develop at a time when the internal political set-up is relatively calm and orderly. The present government is a dictatorship under the direction of Colonel Fulgencia Batista, but almost no Cuban government has ever been anything else.

The Batista regime, however, in recent months has set a record for governmental stability. Political exiles have been pardoned and released from jail or welcomed back from foreign countries. Nazi and Communist political parties are quiet and inactive.

There have been no demonstrations in the streets of Havana, no political massacres, no marching of private armies — occurrences which used to be commonplace.

This doesn't mean that the Cuban government is no longer graft-ridden. It is. But Americans always forget, in considering Latin American politics, that south of Florida graft seems to be an accepted and an almost necessary adjunct of government.

Cubans divide political grafters into three categories: Those that bathe and distribute the drops of water to their followers. Those that bathe and keep all the drops of water for themselves. And those that don't bathe but nevertheless hand out the drops of water.

That a politician could exist, and not fit into one of these categories, is a condition impossible for the Cuban mind to conceive. The best politician in the Cuban viewpoint is the one that belongs to the first category. The grafter who shares his loot with his followers is considered the most sensible, the most honorable and therefore the best governing official.

The *politico*, however, who keeps all the graft for himself and doesn't reward his lieutenants is thought to be dangerous since he will invariably provoke a revolt inside his own party.

The *politico* who doesn't take any graft is considered to be a fool whose honesty will only bring about a general looting of the treasury by his helpers.

The majority of Cubans consider Colonel Batista to belong to the first type of politician and are therefore quite satisfied with him. They would hate to see him go, but go he certainly will if the economic condition is not soon alleviated.

* * *

If any American becomes morally indignant about the way Cubans conduct their government, he should remember that much of the graft that is paid the Cuban administration comes from American sources. He should also remember that in the final analysis the Cuban government is run by American bankers and diplomats.

Before any law passes the Cuban legislature it goes to a few Havana law firms for approval. These law firms are the unofficial representatives of American banking and business interests.

If the law firms say "no," the bill is defeated. If they say "yes," the bill is passed.

Any desired changes are usually supplied by the law firms after consultation with their powerful American clients.

The United States has used this backhanded system of governing Cuba ever since we secured the nation's "independence" from Spain in the Spanish-American war. All in all, it has worked to the mutual advantage of both countries.

This subtle form of imperialism, however, has only succeeded because of the natural tendency of Cubans to trust and admire the United States.

Let the hereditary friendship of most Cubans for America weaken, and the whole basis of U. S.-Cuban relations will undergo a sudden change. The direct will be substituted for the indirect method of governing. Government by suggestion will yield to government by threat and force.

Once this is brought about, Cuban Nazis and Communists will have a fertile field for their anti-U. S. propaganda. The great stumbling block to the radical movements in Cuba, so far, has been the little country's staunch pro-Americanism. And precisely because of this, Cuban subversives are now privately cheering the refusal of the American Government to grant their country a $50-million loan.

With every American greatly concerned about the defense of the Western Hemisphere, it seems strangely paradoxical that official Washington is paying no more attention to the dangerous situation developing in Cuba.

The little island nation is the nearest of all Latin America to our strategic Eastern seaboard. It commands the Atlantic entrance to the Panama Canal. It would be an ideal spot for the construction of enemy air bases.

And most important of all, Havana, which has one of the world's best harbors, could be turned into an impregnable enemy naval base.

Our Government should weigh the Cuban situation carefully.

Behind the War

What About Red Russia?

BEFORE America travels any further on the road to war there is one important question which British statesmen, and their American aiders, should make clear.

What is to be America's attitude toward Soviet Russia?

We ask this question of the British statesmen—and their American puppets—because we know that America's foreign policies have been created and conditioned by Britain's foreign policies—and especially is this true in the case of America's attitude toward the U. S. S. R.

President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and Secretary Stimson studiously avoided all reference to Soviet Russia as an "aggressor" nation.

They stigmatize Germany, Italy, and Japan as "aggressor" nations but they pass over the fact that Soviet Russia *is the most aggressive of all aggressors* in its rape of North China, Poland, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Northern Roumania.

They did not mention, of course, that Soviet Russia and Germany are allies in waging this war and that Soviet Russia is now co-operating with Japan and Italy—the other members of the fascistern—to provide Germany with essential war materials.

We know that British diplomats and statesmen have vowed to wage this war, until Germany is completely beaten into submission.

For the sake of shortening the argument, let us imagine (if we can) Germany's Axis beaten and blasted by bombers, battleships and blockade, and forced to surrender.

In the subsequent peace conferences Nazi Germany would no doubt be broken up into five or six puny puppet States. France would be restored; Czecho-Slovakia recreated, and Austria resurrected from the oblivion of membership in the Reich; German-occupied Poland would again obtain its sovereignty and independence, together with Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Norway and Roumania.

So far so good. But, will Russia, too, be forced to withdraw from Poland and Roumania, together with Germany? Russia's annexations of these territories were made possible only by Germany's previous subjugation of them.

Furthermore, what will happen to North China, Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania and Finland, now incorporated into the Soviet Union — an aggression and occupation made possible only through Germany's conspiracy and co-operation?

We remember, too, that Germany would never have dared to enter Poland, unless Russia had given the go-ahead signal for this war through the notorious Nazi-Soviet pacts of August, 1939.

The question is therefore in order — since America and Great Britain are fighting to preserve the "democracies" of the world, and to safeguard the independence of smaller nations—what is their attitude towards Soviet Russia whose gains have been the greatest in the war and without whose help Germany would never have been able to enter the war?

We realize that Anglo-American diplomatic policies toward Soviet Russia are based on the assumption that it is wise to try to swing the U.S.S.R. either onto our side as an ally, or into an attitude of benevolent neutrality.

The thought is that it is much better to have the huge Russian bear on our side, or inactive, rather than allied with the Axis powers against us; no matter how much American and British citizens may disapprove of Red Russia's acts and policies.

But the facts indicate that, in spite of America and England making all kinds of concessions to Russia, the Soviet is still co-operating and conspiring with Germany to continue the war as it conspired and aided Germany to start the war.

* * *

After months of negotiations which terminated rudely in the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreements, Britain could not offer Russia sufficient inducements to enter the war.

It is difficult to understand what America and Britain can now offer Russia to secure an alliance or neutrality.

Stalin's Russia is playing the game of constantly upping the bid for its services by using the possibility of an alliance with America and England against an actual agreement with Nazi Germany.

The United States has made many concessions to Russia:

Despite the letter of protest addressed to Kalinin, America has accepted the Russian occupation and annexation of Finland.

Notwithstanding the embargo on the gold which Russia seized by the occupation of Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania, America continues to purchase Russian gold at premium prices, even gold seized by armed occupation.

Despite America's embargo on the shipment of war materials to belligerents, and the provisions of our "Cash and Carry" neutrality, America has released to Soviet Russia ships, machine tools, metals, cotton, wheat, etc., which both Americans and British know will eventually reach Germany for use in war.

Despite Under-Secretary Welles' protests to Ambassador Oumansky that Russia has violated every provision of the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement, America has tried to induce Russia to enter the Anglo-Australian-American agreement covering the defense of the Far East and of the British Empire.

Notwithstanding the espionage and sabotage carried on in American industries essential to defense, by agents of the Comintern, America will not condemn or prosecute Communist fifth columnists in America as enemy agents.

In spite of Russia's recent mass murders in occupied territories, American diplomats will not mention this barbarism which is unprecedented in history.

America continues to subsidize Sovietism in Russia by purchasing Russian gold and shipping to Russia for resale metals, tools, and commodities essential to the defense of America.

Although President Roosevelt withdrew all ambassadors from other European nations, the State Department has maintained Lawrence Steinhardt in Moscow; and actually loaned his services to the Soviet Foreign Office in recent diplomatic conversations with Bulgaria's Boris.

Americans have not forgotten the *City of Flint* incident and the undiplomatic and impolitic conduct of the Soviet Foreign Office.

This thumbnail sketch, as it were, of America's diplomatic relations with Russia, pursued on the advice of the British Foreign Secretarist, illustrates the point that America would sacrifice everything to fight this war as an ally of Red Russia; and that, thus far, America's actions and concessions have been foolhardy and suicidal to the defense of our own nation and the world.

* * *

Suddenly, the other day, the United States Maritime Commission decided — and without public announcement — that no more American ships could be chartered to the Russians.

This action, no doubt, was taken on the advice of the British Minister of Economic Warfare who had complained lately that Russians were buying and shipping American goods through Vladivostok to Germany.

The decision to embargo the chartering of ships to Russia interrupted six months of American commercial co-operation with the Soviet. During this period Stalin exhibited less antagonism to Great Britain. But a few days after the Russian government announced the conclusion of a new and more exhaustive trade pact with the Reich, the U. S. Maritime Commission took drastic action.

As usual, the great independent American nation had acted as Little Sir Echo on British orders! The British, apparently, abandoned hope of weaning Stalin away from Hitler, and passed the word along that America must stop trading with Russia. America, the puppet colonial government of the British Empire, promptly obeyed.

If England and Russia once more fix things up and Britain said so, an independent America would become a Soviet ally tomorrow.

* * *

So if Great Britain and America win this war, Soviet Russia will become the strongest nation in Europe and Asia.

Germany, exhausted and cut up into many defenseless States, will no longer be the bulwark against Bolshevism in Europe that it was up until the Hitler-Stalin pact.

Post-war Europe, unsettled, starving, suffering and devastated, will be easy prey for Communist attack within and Soviet aggression from without.

Post-war Europe and Asia will be a crimson harvest for the Red gleaners. The example of Finland, East Poland, Bessarabia, Latvia, Esthonia and Lithuania will be the prototype of Soviet grabs in other territories and States of Europe.

Stalin's dream of the control of the Dardanelles will be realized in a war-exhausted and paralyzed Middle Europe. When the Red armies march into conquered territories, Red commissars and secret police will follow the armies, to impose Sovietism on the conquered peoples through mass starvation. The *bourgeoisie* will be systematically liquidated, as in Poland and Finland.

* * *

The important question now is if Britain wins the war with our help, and so pros-

(Continued on Page 12)

Comment

(Continued from Page 11)

trates Europe as to make it an easy prey for the Russian Reds; does Britain expect, with American help, to protect Europe from conquest, annexation and Sovietization by the Reds?

To carry out its peace program as announced against the threat of Hitler's new European order, Britain must be prepared to go on and protect sovereign and independent nations from falling victims to Bolshevism.

Could Britain be fighting Naziism only to make way for Sovietism?

The question resolves itself to this: Will Britain and America fight Soviet Russia and Communism, as they now fight Germany and Naziism?

If Britain proposes seriously to enforce its peace aims, Britain must be prepared to fight Sovietism after the Nazis are defeated.

Will Britain expect an all-out aid from America in waging this crusade against Hitler's blood brother, Stalin?

Will American radicals and liberals in power be as willing to deal, lease and lend to Britain in her war against Russia, as they are now to aid her in her crusade against Germany?

In other words, what is America's policy regarding Red Russia, the conqueror and aggressor in Europe and Asia, once Germany is dispensed with, and becomes a Soviet dependency through revolution and aggression?

Senator O'Mahoney Blames War On Capitalism

SENATOR O'MAHONEY, Democrat from Wyoming, stated definitely that the present war is a last-ditch fight for the survival of capitalism under the guise of "democracy."

At a final public meeting of the Temporary National Economic Committee of which he is chairman, the Senator made the above statement.

This Temporary National Economic Committee was set up at President Roosevelt's request in June, 1938, to make a comprehensive study of "concentration of economic power."

Meanwhile, the ordinary man in the street and in the factory believes that this war is being fought to "preserve democracy." However, affairs are so arranged that the ordinary man in the street or in the factory is not supposed to find out the truth of any war motives until twenty years will have elapsed.

Commenting on Senator O'Mahoney's statement, the press of the nation said that it was "full of phrases that might have been borrowed from any Socialist Party campaign book."

The press does not deny the veracity of what the Senator says. It simply smears his findings by endeavoring to label them "socialistic."

For example, the chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee said:

"Our economic ills arise from the fact that in the modern industrial world men do not and cannot own the tools with which they must work."

This statement is correct. Opponents cannot deny it. They simply seek to defend the position of modern capitalism by saying that the Senator's findings smack of "Socialism."

* * *

In his summation, the Wyoming Senator specifically mentioned the Aluminum Company of America. He intimated that if there is a shortage of aluminum, it was the outcome of the monopoly position of the Mellon-controlled Aluminum Company of America.

Using this corporation as an example of concentration of economic power, he said:

"The incontrovertible fact is that although the deposits in which aluminum appears are very extensive and there are plenty of sources of idle power to develop the deposits, no serious competition with the Aluminum Company of America has come into existence during the last generation . . .

"It takes big capital to compete with big capital and the hesitancy of the owners of capital to invest funds to compete with a large established industry is one of the elements which produce idle."

Senator O'Mahoney said that his committee was asked to "study the concentration of economic power and to find out why, with all the unlimited resources nature affords, money, machines and men have been idle, with consequent hardship and sufferings for millions."

Commenting upon our failure — not to produce—to distribute goods, he said: "If, however, we are frank with ourselves we must realize that if the democratic world had succeeded in the past in distributing the products of commerce and industry among the masses—if it had been successful in preventing the growth of the proletariat—there never would have been such a thing as the rise of the Totalitarian State."

In other words, he blamed the rise of totalitarianism upon the abuses of capitalism.

* * *

Incidentally, Mr. Raymond Clapper — the columnist — brazenly stated recently that this war is between the "free nations" and the "slave nations." He openly admitted that British imperialism and its allies had enslaved Russia, Germany, Italy and other nations.

And he is disturbed because the slaves are seeking their freedom from the gold chains which were holding them bound to the rock of destitution.

Meanwhile, the American people will believe that this is a war to preserve democracy when it is nothing more than a war to preserve the ill-gotten gains corralled by the internationalists who control the waving both of the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes.

Some day, the common people and the small propertyholders in America will appreciate this when they ask themselves: "What did we get out of this World War except taxes, loss of property, loss of liberty and loss of morals?"

* * *

Senator O'Mahoney is right in blaming the rise of totalitarianism upon the abuses of capitalism.

And the clerics, educators, politicians and parrots who are busy damning totalitarianism (as it should be damned) should interest themselves in the causes which produced a Hitler, a Stalin, a Mussolini and their collectivist method of living.

Capitalism cannot hold nations enslaved forever.

And the supporters of the capitalism, whose abuses are now more notorious than its virtues, cannot hope to escape the wrath of slave nations or of the slave persons within their own nations.

Let's be sensible!

Let us liquidate the causes of totalitarianism by cleaning up the abuses of greedy, exploiting capitalism.

Incidentally, the committee headed by Senator O'Mahoney is composed of three members of the House of Representatives and two members of the Senate.

Their names are listed as follows:

Rep. Sumners (Dem., Texas), Williams (Dem., Mo.) and Reece (Rep., Tenn.); Senators O'Mahoney and White (Rep., Maine); Senator King (Dem., Utah) was a member but he is no longer a member of the Senate and his place is vacant.

The other members on the committee represent the Treasury, Justice, Labor and Commerce Departments plus the S.E.C. and the Federal Trade Commission.

They include Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General in charge of anti-trust law enforcement; Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce; Jerome Frank, S.E.C. chairman; Isador Lubin, commissioner of labor statistics; and Leon Henderson, S.E.C. commissioner and a N.D.A.C. member.

Self-Sacrifice?

SIR WALTER CITRINE, British Labor leader, now touring America, made the following statement in New York City:

"We believe that the United States should make an effort to supply us *even to the extent of denuding themselves to aid us.*"

In his syndicated column, Boake Carter comments upon the above statement:

"If the United States," said he, "were attacked by a powerful foreign nation, how many other nations in this world would 'denude themselves'?

"For my part, having lived in thirteen foreign nations at various times of my life, I am quite sure that none would 'denude' itself, for the very simple reason that most other nations, if not all, that I have ever been to, believe in defending themselves and their own people foremost. Then, if they have anything left over, they might consider selling it, loaning it or giving it away."

Comment

Samuel Dickstein vs. Martin Dies

HORATIO ALGER'S success story was more than matched in the life of Samuel Dickstein, Russian-born Jew, now one of the most prominent Representatives in Washington.

Mr. Dickstein has never been a Herculean opponent of Sovietism.

Mr. Dickstein always has been a hawkish scrutineer of anti-Semite subversism — so hawkish that he is gifted with a peculiar sense of vision which permits him to discover a man under every old maid's bed.

Recently Mr. Dickstein assailed Representative Martin Dies and his Committee for the Investigation of un-American Activities.

The assault was committed at a meeting of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League at New York's Hotel Astor.

"Mr. Dies and his committee," said Mr. Dickstein, "in two a half years and at the cost of $800,000 to the citizens of our country, has accomplished nothing. We got absolutely nothing for our money. He has not found one spy or Fifth Columnist who can be convicted as such on legal evidence adduced by this 'Dies, Dies and Dies' committee, as it should be known.

"At a great outlay of money his committee has issued a lot of bunk when he could have obtained more information than he has gathered from your pamphlets and without cost. Dies has sold the country a gold brick. Now this superman asks for a million dollars more to enable him to persecute a lot of innocent people."

* * *

We might ask some questions of Mr. Dickstein:

What has been your attitude towards Josef Stalin?

What record did you make in castigating the communistic minded Mexican government?

On what side did you stand in the Spanish civil war?

What opinions did you express concerning the American League for Peace and Democracy?

What views did you entertain relative to the deportation of Harry Bridges?

When did you change your mind — if ever — relative to Russia's being a "democracy"?

What criticism did you launch against Dr. Einstein who affronted the American public in his "no personal God" statement?

When — if ever — did you favor an "all out" program for Ireland, persecuted since 1142 until 1941 by the British?

In what year did you seek action on the part of the United States to dissociate herself from Bolshevik Russia, the murderer of millions of Christians?

These are only some of the questions, Mr. Dickstein, which America feels that you should answer when you assume to castigate Martin Dies whose Congressional investigating committee you have not been helping in any marked degree.

Incidentally, to be fair in our criticism of Senators and Representatives who are foreign-born, like yourself, we lift from Pearson and Allen's *"Washington Merry-Go-Round"* (Jan. 17) the following information which they circulated:

"Amid all the breast-thumping on Capitol Hill about aliens, it is interesting to note that 20 members of the new Congress are foreign-born.

"Three are veteran Senators — Robert F. Wagner, New York New Dealer, author of the Labor Relations and Social Security Acts, born in Germany; James J. Davis, Pennsylvania Republican, former Secretary of Labor, born in Wales, and James E. Murray, Montana Democrat, born in Canada.

"The 17 in the House came from all parts of the world and some of them still have strong foreign accents.

"B. J. Gehrmann, of Wisconsin, and Leonard W. Schuetz, of Illinois, were born in Germany. Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, and Rudolph Tenerowicz, of Michigan, were born in Austria. Incidentally, when Stefan gives a radio talk for the folks back home, he says goodby in four different languages, including German.

"Two were born in Russia — Samuel Dickstein, of New York, and Herman Kopplemann, of Connecticut. Rep. Samuel Weiss, of Pennsylvania, was born in Poland, and Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, the genial, popular dean of the House, in Czecho-Slovakia.

"There are two Canadian-born members of the House — Charles Eaton, of New Jersey, and Albert Rutherford, of Pennsylvania. William Barry, of New York, was born in Ireland, and Frank Crowther, of New York, and Robert Ramsay, of West Virginia, in England.

"Robert Crosser, of Ohio, and George Gillie, of Indiana, were born in Scotland; Noah Mason, of Illinois, in Wales, and Pehr Holmes, of Massachusetts, in Sweden."

And we pause to remark that it is one thing to be foreign-born, subject to another flag and foreign-born, but always, from birth, a citizen of the United States.

Perhaps you understand what we mean, Mr. Dickstein.

Nevertheless, we congratulate the Horatio Alger accent which you have put upon American life.

Detroit Jewish Chronicle

IN ITS January 10th edition, the *Detroit Jewish Chronicle* printed the following, which requires no comment:

"Pro-Nazis in this country are hard at work to accomplish their end of dealing a death blow to democracy.

"For the first time since the outbreak of the war, we heard a few people hissing England and applauding Hitler during the showing of the *March of Time* British R.A.F. film.

"At the meeting of the *America First Committee* in Chicago on Dec. 23, there was a disturbance when Irving Berlin's *'God Bless America'* was to be sung, and the pro-Nazi element won by suppressing the song by the Jewish composer.

"It was the first Nazi victory in this country against a Jewish author.

"All of which indicates the need for strengthening the democratic elements and of adopting a militant attitude in defense of liberty and in the fight against Naziism.

"We are confident that in the long run the pro-Nazis will lose. But this will only be possible if the conscious libertarians will assert themselves."

* * *

Of course, the imprudent young man responsible for spreading this invitation to spread anti-Semitism is Philip Slomovitz, editor of the paper.

Phil generally succeeds in keeping both feet in it, especially when he tells his Jewish readers of the need *to adopt a militant attitude.*

Capitalism, the Bunk!

SPEAKING in Detroit recently, Gen. Hugh Johnson said that if the Knudsen commission fails, capitalism will be blamed for the failure.

The General's words were these:

"It is all up to the Knudsen Office of Production Management on the one hand and industry on the other, and when I say it is up to them, I say it in the most serious sense. For if they fail, if they even falter, you are going to hear one of the most sinister cries that was ever echoed in America. It is this:

" 'The capitalist system is no good. We gave it every opportunity, it tried and it failed; industrial leadership is incompetent; we entrusted our fate to the cream of it, and it soured. Now, let the Government take over industry, let the people's representatives, the social workers, semi-socialists and neo-revolutionists run this effort. We would be better off in the hands of social-minded amateurs than in capitalist misfits.'

"Make no mistake about it, that kind of talk is in the air. The O.P.M. has got to do its stuff."

SOCIAL JUSTICE—weeks ago—pointed out that the enemies of capitalism who have surged over Washington will see that Mr. Knudsen's commission is a failure. There will be strikes. There will be sabotage. There will be a cancellation of blueprints, substitution of plans, confusion, disorder and disruption not only in the ranks of labor but in the ranks of industry itself.

And all this will be brought about by little commissars operating in offices at Washington — and on the Government payroll.

* * *

We have reason to believe that there are those in our country—if not in our Government — who are planning to make Mr. Knudsen a failure.

Can they succeed before Britain — pardon us, we mean England — will have surrendered to the Nazi aggression?

Will they succeed before peace will be declared in Europe?

It is their hope that peace will be withheld until such time as the United States of America can be Marxianized.

In certain circles it is being whispered that the war is over, as far as England is concerned. Victory is already on the side of the collectivists.

Their only concern is victory or defeat in America — and this through the aggression of bankruptcy rather than through the aggression of military forces.

Win, lose or draw, a major depression is facing America when peace does "break out."

As usual, those who applauded loudest the statements of the war-mongers will be those who will pay most following the war.

Letters

(SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally, the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.)

Fr. Coughlin Told Us

TO THE EDITOR:

The same men whom F.D.R. condemned as "economic royalists" are now backing him 100 per cent in his war aims.

Why?

Well, for one thing, war profits, of which there will be plenty. For another, Britain and the U.S.A. are run by the same group of international money changers.

They will have to give up that inhumane racket if Germany wins the "battle of Britain." Who is going to lend F.D.R. those fountain pen billions then?

Now the "great humanitarian" would lead us to war to cover up the glaring failure to bring back prosperity by peaceful means, even with all that usurped power and eight years of spending.

Our own beloved Father Coughlin warned of these heart-rending things—and of those we are yet to suffer. The least we can do is to admit his wisdom and support him more loyally in the future.

His brave and timely aid to the 17 young Christians is also to be commended.

Bronx, N. Y. —C.H.

An Economic War

TO THE EDITOR:

Too few persons seek the real cause of the present European conflict. Some 70-million Germans, in economic slavery because they had no gold, decided that they would challenge an established, upright-eous, international, gold-based, financial capitalism in order to live; so a system of barter between themselves and other countries was inaugurated.

In this circumventing of their existing, cruel, gold based system by barter, the gold controllers of London saw the end of their economic domination of the world with gold, so England declared war on Germany.

It is a struggle between two economic systems; a new system challenging the old.

England is not fighting to save democracy, nor to remove moral evil or injustice. She is fighting to retain and perpetuate an unjust, international, financial capitalism which, in its operation, inflicts misery and poverty upon all the peoples of the earth—including Americans—and this nation should hang its head in shame for aiding or supporting such a subtle, persecuting agency.

Congress should retain the *Neutrality Act* and the *Johnson Act*.

Our job is to make America safe for the Americans and not try to run the world.

—J.A.F.

Malden, Mass.

Fight for What?

TO THE EDITOR:

The following are questions that are being asked every day by people who are at last thinking for themselves: What are we going to fight for? What did we get from the last war except debt, taxes and hospitals filled with disabled veterans?

Is the way of life in Germany so terrible that we have to fight against it? On the other hand, is the way of life in England so good, so perfect and democratic that we have to fight for it—a way of life that has kept 90 per cent of the people in England in virtual slavery while the others are owners, lords, dukes and earls and what have you? (I do not think they rate capitalization.)

A way of life that kicked its King out of office because he said something would have to be done for the poor people.

A way of life that persecuted the Irish, allowing thousands of them to die of hunger when there was plenty of food.

A way of life that has kept the people of India in poverty, slavery and ignorance.

If that is what we are to fight for and die for, and finally pay for, then the one who said that the average American has the intelligence of an 11-year-old child was not far from being right. But he was not doing a favor to the children by the comparison.

Springfield, Mass. —J.O.D.

The Blood Yell!

TO THE EDITOR:

January 9, the Town Meeting of the Air had a debate entitled "Is a Hitler Defeat Essential to the U.S." and when Mr. Verne Marshall stood up to answer Mr. Acheson, the Wm. Allen White group booed him. They yelled and howled and would not let him talk. It was terrible.

When we heard this group yelling for war and trying to stop a man from pleading for our country, it came to my mind that the Crucifixion must have been like this, when Christ stood before Pilate and the Jews yelled "Give us Barabbas"!

The White group yelled for war and the blood of our boys. It unnerved me so that I cannot get it from my mind. To think that American people will cry for the blood of their brothers!

—L.B.

New York City.

Asks Movie Guide

TO THE EDITOR:

I read your paper each week and am interested in every one of your articles.

There is one suggestion and that is that you publish a list of motion pictures that are propaganda in order to educate the public to avoid these pictures.

Recently, we have walked out on two separate occasions from theaters because of the hatred portrayed on the screen. As we cannot afford to do this we hope that you will publish such a list.

—M.C.

New York City.

Locked Horns

—Courtesy of Chicago Tribune

Kentucky Farmer

TO THE EDITOR:

As one endorsee and subscriber to the 16 principles of social justice, I ask your permission to publish my answer to the letter appearing on page 16 of the Jan. 6 issue and signed "A Yokel" and captioned *"This writer understands 9th principle of Social Justice."* A difference of opinion exists, which may be considered legitimate.

The Yokel article refers to us farmers as a group. Being a farmer, my defense is of him considered in the nature of personal individual and therefore with as much interest in his working endeavors to earn a living as any of the members of the "Co-op" groups which controlled farmers to their present condition of servitude and bankruptcy by price fixing and other falible forms of regulations to suit the ideas of "supply and demand" fitted like a yoke on his neck according to the rule and will of money and interest manipulators.

Now, Mr. Yokel's article is well read and considered well spoken, and fits the ideas of most city pressure groups, but what he apparently fails to understand appears to the writer herein as two in number of points:

1. In my county seat we have a number of Co-op marketeers: Tobacco, corn, wheat, two live stock auction companies, each controlled by private bankers. The mills, the chain banks and chain stores being as remotely controlled as the huge industrial packing companies so far as the farmer can possibly concern himself, but like the so-called farmer Co-ops, utterly and as poorly regulated as other similar group price-fixing machinery of those who adhere to group psychology of government monopoly itself.

2. The farmers' interests are as diversified as localities or as the fence lines which separate them from their neighbors. Horses, sheep, cattle, goats, hogs, dog raisers of many varieties almost as numerous as the various foods but which are corporately grouped under two Co-op heads who do not operate to make money for the farmers.

My intention is only to call attention to the fact forceably adhered to in politics which has long declared the principle that labor or farmers could never deliver the voting influence *en bloc* to either party as the partisan dividers of the spoils system.

At least the personal farmer has the sense to know that he is not the price regulator of his products and, therefore, realizes his weakness to resist those who operate the mills of the gods which must also grind him excessively fine. He is at least trained in humility and must accept his fate which appears to be crucifixion between two such thieves as the group representatives of organized capital and their divided unions of labor.

Down here the little farmer receives less than the cost of production for his hogs, tobacco and so on. Besides, he gets nothing for cutting out any crops except foreclosure. The big ones lending money fare better.

—G.W.G.

Richmond, Ky.

Letters

Queen of Peace Statue

TO THE EDITOR:

Being a Red Cross nurse, I am familiar with the misery and suffering brought about by the World War of 1917 and 1918.

After reading the evening paper and gazing on the picture of happy young men, going to camp, I could hardly see the picture for the vision of plaster casts, crutches, wooden legs, cork legs, and arms, glass eyes or empty sockets, truly wrecked bodies and shipwrecked souls.

During the night I thought of "Christ of the Andes," and the suggestion came to me that if the women of the United States and the nations in war would petition the Congressmen, Senators and rulers of scuttle the heathen "Goddess of Liberty" that has given us nothing but war and misery, and put in her place "The Queen of Peace," holding aloft in her arms "The Light of the World" and beg of the Prince of Peace to give us peace that the world cannot give.

I sent a dollar to the National Council of Catholic Women to start a fund for a statue of the "Queen of Peace" and suggested that the material be made from the metals from our arsenal.

— E.F.

St. Joseph, Mo.

Our Own Defense

TO THE EDITOR:

Keep up your gallant fight to explode the myth that England is our first line of defense.

We can only depend on our God-given oceans, our Army, Navy and air force, also a strong home front.

Will you please remind your readers to listen to Msgr. Fulton Sheen on Sundays?

— F. F. D.

New York City

Praises Money League

TO THE EDITOR:

Thousands of people are already familiarized with the work of the *Constitutional Money League of America.* Their plan of action should be assisted by all those advocating social justice.

The League leaders have all combined their efforts and produced many valuable works on monetary science. "Constitutional money" is their goal. Part of their plan is to put into high schools throughout the United States a textbook, known as *"Basic Principles of Constitutional Money."*

This book gives the reader all the knowledge of the mechanics of our monetary and economic system. He will learn what are wrong and right and for social justice start to really fight.

Get a copy of this textbook for your school director; get one for your study group.

— A. J. F.

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Disillusioned Doughboy Reasons with His Son

TO THE EDITOR:

Several days ago the President proposed "lending" our guns and bullets to one warring nation to help it whip another warring nation. He maintains we are still neutral in this conflict, when we do this.

He wants to lend these bullets to the belligerent who declared war in the first place because that belligerent, although the richest empire on the face of the globe, is whining for help and crying that it can't pay us for the bullets.

This whimpering belligerent has begged, cajoled and bribed nearly every neutral nation on earth to come and help it. This cry-baby "fighter" pleads with the atheistic Bolshevik, the wild Turk, the peaceful Swiss, the poor Indian, the wealthy Jew, and the Christian American to please come to its aid.

This yelping deceiver has more men, more wealth and more ships in its empire than any of its enemies. Then why is it begging from us? I'll tell you why. It is not manly enough to fight its own battles and never was!

This "fighter" obtained the help of 17 other nations, including the U.S.A., to help it whip the same enemy it is so afraid of today. That was 23 years ago and I was one of those who wasted a year and a half of the best part of my early twenties to help lick that nation's enemy.

Would I do it again, or allow my son to do it? Listen! I'd see my boy in the guard house or digging latrine holes first! I can still reason with him if I can't lick him. And here is what I've told him.

See if you think he'll tramp through French mud without removing his trench shoes for a week; sleep on the ground in lice-infested clothes that he can't take off his dirty body for three weeks at a time; eat canned horse thighs; wait in line in torrential rains for 5 hours to take a bath and then be told he can come back next Sunday; tip his hat and say "yes sir" to an ignorant shave-tail who never went beyond the sixth grade—all for the princely sum of $8 per month—some months.

I asked him if he learned in his history books what nation we had to lick in order to gain our independence in the first place. He said Britain.

I asked him if Britain had any help in that war and he said the history book stated Britain "paid some Hessian soldiers" to come over and try to kill George Washington and our American forefathers.

I asked him what allies Britain had to try to whip us in the next war and he thought it was the American Indians.

I asked him what nation we had to whip in 1812. He said Britain.

I asked him what nation tried to split our country in two when we were in the throes of civil war by sending ships to New Orleans. He again said Britain.

I asked him who burned our Capitol at Washington, D. C. The Britishers.

I asked him who propagandized this country into the first World War and he said Sir Gilbert and the British. I asked him what nation welshed on the largest of war debts. Again, Britain.

I asked him what nation or empire grabbed by deceit and conquest more of God's earth than any empire in history. He knew the answer but he had not been taught that in school.

Now then, I asked him, "Have the Americans ever had to fight Germany, Italy, France or Japan the present enemies of Britain? Then why should you or I or any thinking American help the nation who has given us the most war?"

Looking back over our history, what nation has been our enemy?

Fifty years from now what will historians write of the foolish, simple minded Americans of today who help the Britishers?

What will those future historians call our present leaders in the U. S. Government?

What did the widow of poor President Wilson write in one of the greatest magazines in this country a few years after that disillusioned internationalist died of a broken heart? Did she not write that he was "used" by the European politicians for their own ends, that he was no match for the cunning deceit of them?

We believe our 130-million neighbors right here in this country would be saner, happier and more contented and more unified Americans if we would all work to help ourselves and let the neighbors of other lands do likewise. The Lord knows we have plenty to do in our own country without making enemies of all the peoples in the world except the biggest cry-baby and hypocrite of them all.

We will never receive any thanks if we help the British government to get more of the English people slaughtered.

We might be respected if we minded our own business and told them to finish what they started or take their medicine without bawling. It is not our job to knock their heads together, much as we would like to.

— P.H.C.

Gardner, Mass.

Back Peace Patriots

TO THE EDITOR:

Since Father Coughlin isn't heard on the air, I hope every SOCIAL JUSTICE reader will heed his former advice and send in telegrams, letters, etc., to their Representatives in Washington opposing the repeal of the *Johnson Act* and the *Neutrality Act* and urge them we want peace and no war and also if possible, to join up with a "Peace Committee" at the earliest possible date and stand shoulder to shoulder with the people battling for this cause of "peace."

We have some great patriots in Washington such as Senators Rush Holt, Burton K. Wheeler, Champ Clark and others who are making a heroic battle for our welfare and I am sure they deserve all the aid we can give them.

— Mrs. L. M. T.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

Young Business Men Bear Brunt of Draft Discrimination

TO THE EDITOR:

In these troubled times of war hysteria, it is extremely difficult to find any one to turn to for advice without being branded a fifth columnist.

As I have sold your papers here in Momence a few years ago and several of us have followed the editorials in SOCIAL JUSTICE, I feel sure you are in a position to direct us to some one who could be relied upon to help our cause.

During the entire Presidential campaign there has never been a candidate to any office to take the side of the young men in the age limit of the draft, that is, those boys from 21 to 35. It seems that every one feels that all the young men signed up for conscription out of their own free will when in reality it carried a prison term and a fine thus handicapping all who have dependents of any kind.

Then, too, all the young men in business are social outcasts for, as the bill so ably puts it, if they are called, they will not be compelled to pay their obligations until one year after they return. Considering this, they can not buy anything, such as merchandise or a car, except for cash, and the banks have discriminated against lending to conscriptees for the same reasons. Thus, in our case, where our numbers have been called last, which would leave us here at home two or three years before being called, it means we will be social outcasts for that length of time.

Thus, it is not the year's service to our country that we are opposed to, but to being discriminated against by our business associates and thus costing us from three to four years of our active business life for what?

Is it just to create a market for the DuPont ammunitions?

We realize if we start an organized protest of any kind we would be immediately branded and sent to jail.

We thought that maybe some of the Senators of the United States would be in a much better position to sponsor some action along these lines than anyone else.

— M.A.W.

Momence, Ill.

Comment

Msgr. Smith

QUESTIONABLE British war aims, the fact that there are "two sides" to the present war, and American democracy's inability to withstand another major conflict — these are the compelling reasons for American non-intervention advanced by Monsignor Matthew Smith of Denver, Colorado.

Writing in the *Catholic Register* of which he is editor, Msgr. Smith recently inferred editorially that there is no clear-cut distinction between "right and wrong" in the war abroad and declared that the best interests of the United States lie in remaining out of the conflict.

This is becoming increasingly difficult, however, he said, because of war-mongering propaganda.

"Unless it is checked," the editorial predicted, "we will be involved in less than six months. The pressure is terrific. The British Embassy keeps asking for financial aid from this country. If we give it, the soldiers will follow; that was the case in the first World War. A campaign to link all the English-speaking in one great World Empire has long been under way. Its purpose, of course, is to recruit American men and taxes. The leftists of the United States, whose intellectuals no longer follow Stalin and cannot stomach Hitler, are all for war, as their literature reveals."

Monsignor Smith observes that "our Catholic brethren in England and Canada," who think America should enter the war, are doubtless sincere in their belief that the conflict is between paganism and Christianity.

But he dissents strongly from that view, saying that although there is a great deal of paganism in the Nazi cause, the British record and war aims also are inconsistent with Christian ideals.

"Because he is opposed to the rule of the people, and is an outright fanatic," Msgr. Smith writes, "there is precious little sympathy for him (Hitler) in the United States. But what is the British aim in this war? Outside of statements that promise the eradication of Hitler, it is being deliberately kept quiet. Is there to be another *Versailles Treaty*, laying the seeds for future conflict?"

Msgr. Smith then charges the British with having attempted to eradicate Catholicism in Europe after the World War.

He asks whether there will be "the same attempt to throttle Catholicity that existed before, when Prussia, the least Christian and least trustworthy part of Europe, was put at the head of the new German government and Austria, a Catholic land, was scuttled.

"Despite the fact that Hitler is an Austrian by birth, he is Prussian in spirit, and the Nazi movement is Prussian," Msgr. Smith continued. "The war-mongers are not the people of Bavaria, of Austria and of other Catholic parts of the great old German nation. From scholars of England and Germany we know positively that British politicians, both in our own and in previous days, preferred to take a chance on the Prussian spirit rather than to allow a Catholic power to rise. For the same reason they paid scant attention to the claims of Italy, which fought with England in the last war and is against her today.

"Whether we like or dislike Hitler it cannot be claimed that the Germans had no cause for complaint. While we like British democracy, it is pretty hard to see why its preservation has to hinder the normal development of the Mediterranean nations. England has no more right to iron control of that sea than Italy has to Greece."

Msgr. Smith cautioned against being led to believe "that this war does not have two sides."

Regardless of his open sympathy for the British as against the Nazis, Msgr. Smith asserted, he "is not willing to scuttle the United States or to endanger our financial set-up to save the commercial interests of the empire."

He said that unless American ships are kept out of war zones, the United States will soon have cause for war, meaning, probably, that German vessels would attack American ships, thus provoking war.

Attacking the propaganda and pressure groups operating to edge this nation into the conflict, Msgr. Smith said, "It is not for the propagandists, the British Embassy, the pinkos, or even some Catholic writers of England and Canada to show us our moral duty. We are fully capable of reaching this judgment ourselves."

Mr. Voorhis Sponsors Monetary Reform

ANY increase in the powers of the Federal Reserve banks, such as those proposed recently by Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve System, would expand the already broad powers of that privately owned institution, Congressman Jerry Voorhis of California told the House of Representatives.

He said that "if the Federal Reserve Board were, as it ought to be, an agent of Congress controlling the monetary system of this nation through a public institution and solely in the public interest, we could view this matter differently from what we do at present.

"For at present the Board, though appointed by the President, runs an essentially private business. The 12 central Federal Reserve banks are owned completely by the private member banks of the System, and increases in the Board's powers, therefore, will always be likewise increases in the power of those privately-owned banks until we do what should have been done in the first place — namely, make the 12 central Federal Reserve banks the property of the people of the United States."

Congressman Voorhis conceded that there should be safeguards against inflation — the alleged purpose of Eccles' proposals — but declared that so far there is no evidence of a dangerous inflationary movement. On the other hand, he asserted, present price levels are still about 20 per cent under those of 1926.

"I do not understand," the California Representative said, "why we should get in such a panic every time there is a danger of our getting full employment and restoring the price level for basic commodities, but do not correspondingly get excited when a deflation takes place which deprives real wealth of a great proportion of its value in reference to money and causes loss of employment and foreclosure of farms."

* * *

We Americans are victims of "money illusion" — of a distorted notion regarding the value of real wealth, Mr. Voorhis continued.

"We think," he said, "that property rises and falls in value. We think, for example, that there is less nourishment in the crops you get off the farm in one period than in another, and so with other real wealth, when, as a matter of fact, what happens is not that real wealth is worth more or less but that the volume of money is contracted or expanded, and thus each dollar changes in its value relative to real wealth."

Mr. Voorhis denounced, as have Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, the Federal Reserve's usurped powers to create money.

He said the Board's proposal to nullify President Roosevelt's authority to issue $3-billion in currency arises from the desire to arrogate more money-creating powers to itself rather than share it with the President.

* * *

The fractional reserve policy governing bank lending should be superseded by a system requiring 100 per cent reserves, Voorhis pointed out.

The Congressman added: "As long as the fractional reserve system exists the banks themselves can exercise what should be the sovereign right of Congress to create money which the *Constitution* says belongs to Congress alone."

Under the fractional reserve system banks can lend money they do not have, money that actually does not exist. Still they lend it by a simple bookkeeping process, and receive not only interest in return, but also exact re-payment of the fictitious principal in real money.

This was pointed out to the nation many years ago by Father Coughlin, as was another banking evil described by Mr. Voorhis — the issuance of Federal Reserve notes.

The latter is another medium by which the privately-owned Federal Reserve banks create money, although that function constitutionally belongs to Congress.

"When a bank buys a Government bond," Voorhis explained, "it simultaneously creates a deposit with which to buy the bond, thus creating in each private bank, in effect, a little mint. Then the bond becomes security for the deposit and can, in fact, be used as collateral for an issue of Federal Reserve notes."

Thus the *bank actually issues currency*, despite the fact that the notes are printed in the Government mints. In addition, the bank receives interest on the Government bonds, which comes out of the pocket of every American taxpayer.

As a remedy for the muddled financial system which operates to the advantage of the wealthy, private bankers, Voorhis urged, first, that the Government practice of accepting its bonds as collateral for Federal Reserve notes be discontinued; and second, that 100 per cent reserves be required for demand deposits.

Coupled with his initial suggestion that the 12 central Federal Reserve banks be made the property of the United States Government, Voorhis advanced the proposal that a permanent agency, under the direct control of Congress, be appointed to stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar.

Here Are Your Senators and Congressmen: Write to Them

IN RESPONSE to numerous reader requests, SOCIAL JUSTICE herewith presents the names of the Senators and Representatives comprising the new 77th United States Congress, which convened January 3.

The list is that published in the current edition of the official *Congressional Directory*.

Correspondence to Senators should be addressed care of the Senate Office Building; to Representatives, care of the House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Write to them NOW and insist that they act to stop all further steps toward war!

Senators:

ALABAMA
John Hollis Bankhead, Jasper
Lister Hill, Montgomery

ARIZONA
Carl Hayden, Phoenix
Ernest W. McFarland, Florence

ARKANSAS
Hattie W. Caraway, Jonesboro
John E. Miller, Searcy

CALIFORNIA
Hiram Warren Johnson, San Francisco
Sheridan Downey, Atherton

COLORADO
Alva Blanchard Adams, Pueblo
Edwin Carl Johnson, Denver

CONNECTICUT
Francis Maloney, Meriden
John A. Danaher, Hartford

DELAWARE
James E. Hughes, Dover
James M. Tunnell, Georgetown

FLORIDA
Charles O. Andrews, Orlando
Claude Pepper, Tallahassee

GEORGIA
Walter Franklin George, Vienna
Richard Brevard Russell, Winder

IDAHO
D. Worth Clark, Pocatello
John Thomas, Gooding

ILLINOIS
Scott W. Lucas, Havana
C. Wayland Brooks, Chicago

INDIANA
Frederick Van Nuys, Indianapolis
Raymond E. Willis, Angola

IOWA
Guy Mark Gillette, Cherokee
Clyde LaVerne Herring, Des Moines

KANSAS
Arthur Capper, Topeka
Clyde Martin Reed, Parsons

KENTUCKY
Alben William Barkley, Paducah
Albert Benjamin Chandler, Versailles

LOUISIANA
John Holmes Overton, Alexandria
Allen Joseph Ellender, Houma

MAINE
Ralph O. Brewster, Dexter
Wallace Humphrey White, Jr., Auburn

MARYLAND
Millard E. Tydings, Havre de Grace
George L. Radcliffe, Baltimore

MASSACHUSETTS
David Ignatius Walsh, Fitchburg
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Beverly

MICHIGAN
Arthur H. Vandenberg, Grand Rapids
Prentiss M. Brown, St. Ignace

MINNESOTA
Henrik Shipstead, Miltona
Joseph Hurst Ball, St. Paul

MISSISSIPPI
Pat Harrison, Gulfport
Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, Poplarville

MISSOURI
Bennett Champ Clark, St. Louis County
Harry S. Truman, Independence

MONTANA
Burton Kendall Wheeler, Butte
James E. Murray, Butte

NEBRASKA
George W. Norris, McCook
Hugh A. Butler, Omaha

NEVADA
Patrick A. McCarran, Reno
Berkeley L. Bunker, Las Vegas

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Styles Bridges, East Concord
Charles William Tobey, Temple

NEW JERSEY
William H. Smathers, Margate
W. Warren Barbour, Locust

NEW MEXICO
Carl A. Hatch, Clovis
Dennis Chavez, Albuquerque

NEW YORK
Robert F. Wagner, New York City
James M. Mead, Buffalo

NORTH CAROLINA
Josiah William Bailey, Raleigh
Robert Rice Reynolds, Asheville

NORTH DAKOTA
Gerald P. Nye, Cooperstown
William Langer, Bismarck

OHIO
Robert Alphonso Taft, Cincinnati
Harold Hitz Burton, Cleveland

OKLAHOMA
Elmer Thomas, Medicine Park
Josh Lee, Norman

OREGON
Charles L. McNary, Salem
Rufus C. Holman, Portland

PENNSYLVANIA
James John Davis, Pittsburgh
Joseph F. Guffey, Pittsburgh

RHODE ISLAND
Peter G. Gerry, Warwick
Theodore Francis Green, Providence

SOUTH CAROLINA
Ellison DuRant Smith, Lynchburg
James Francis Byrnes, Spartanburg

SOUTH DAKOTA
William John Bulow, Beresford
Chan Gurney, Yankton

TENNESSEE
Kenneth McKellar, Memphis
Tom Stewart, Winchester

TEXAS
Morris Sheppard, Texarkana
Tom Connally, Marlin

UTAH
Elbert Duncan Thomas, Salt Lake City
Abe Murdock, Beaver

VERMONT
Warren Robinson Austin, Burlington
George David Aiken, Putney

VIRGINIA
Carter Glass, Lynchburg
Harry Flood Byrd, Berryville

WASHINGTON
Homer Truett Bone, Tacoma
Monrad C. Wallgren, Everett

WEST VIRGINIA
Matthew M. Neely, Fairmont
Harley Martin Kilgore, Beckley

WISCONSIN
Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., Madison
Alexander Wiley, Chippewa Falls

WYOMING
Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Cheyenne
H. H. Schwartz, Casper

Representatives:

ALABAMA
District 1—Frank William Boykin, Mobile
2—George McInvale Grant, Troy
3—Henry Bascom Steagall, Ozark
4—Sam Hobbs, Selma
5—Joe Starnes, Guntersville
6—Pete Jarman, Livingston
7—Walter Will Bankhead, Jasper
8—John J. Sparkman, Huntsville
9—Luther Patrick, Birmingham

ARIZONA
At Large John Robert Murdock, Tempe

ARKANSAS
District 1—Ezekiel Candler Gathings, West Memphis
2—Wilbur D. Mills, Kensett
3—Clyde Taylor Ellis, Bentonville
4—Fadjo Cravens, Fort Smith
5—David Dickson Terry, Little Rock
6—William Frank Norrell, Monticello
7—Oren Harris, El Dorado

CALIFORNIA
District 1—Clarence Frederick Lea, Santa Rosa
2—Harry Lane Englebright, Nevada City
3—Frank Henry Buck, Vacaville
4—Thomas Rolph, San Francisco
5—Richard J. Welch, San Francisco
6—Albert E. Carter, Oakland
7—John H. Tolan, Oakland
8—John Z. Anderson, San Juan Bautista
9—Bertrand W. Gearhart, Fresno
10—Alfred J. Elliott, Tulare
11—Carl Hinshaw, Pasadena
12—Jerry Voorhis, San Dimas
13—Charles Kramer, Los Angeles
14—Thomas Francis Ford, Los Angeles
15—John Martin Costello, Hollywood
16—Leland M. Ford, Santa Monica
17—Lee E. Geyer, Gardena

(Continued on Page 18)

(Continued from Page 17)

18—Ward Johnson, Long Beach
19—Harry R. Sheppard, Yucaipa
20—Edouard Victor Michel Izac, San Diego

COLORADO

District 1—Lawrence Lewis, Denver
2—William S. Hill, Fort Collins
3—J. Edgar Chenoweth, Trinidad
4—Edward Thomas Taylor, Glenwood Springs

CONNECTICUT

At Large Lucien J. Maciora, New Britain
District 1—Herman Paul Kopplemann, Hartford
2—William J. Fitzgerald, Norwich
3—James A. Shanley, New Haven
4—LeRoy D. Downs, South Norwalk
5—J. Joseph Smith, Prospect

DELAWARE

At Large Philip Andrew Traynor, Wilmington

FLORIDA

District 1—James Hardin Peterson, Lakeland
2—Robert Alexis Green, Starke
3—Robert L. F. Sikes, Crestview
4—Pat Cannon, Miami
5—Joe Hendricks, De Land

GEORGIA

District 1—Hugh Peterson, Ailey
2—Edward Eugene Cox, Camilla
3—Stephen Pace, Americus
4—Albert Sidney Camp, Newnan
5—Robert Ramspeck, Atlanta
6—Carl Vinson, Milledgeville
7—Malcolm Connor Tarver, Dalton
8—John S. Gibson, Douglas
9—B. Frank Whelchel, Gainesville
10—Paul Brown, Elberton

IDAHO

District 1—Compton I. White, Clarksfork
2—Henry C. Dworshak, Burley

ILLINOIS

At Large —Stephen A. Day, Evanston
At Large —William G. Stratton, Morris
District 1—Arthur W. Mitchell, Chicago
2—Raymond S. McKeough, Chicago
3—Edward A. Kelly, Chicago
4—Harry P. Beam, Chicago
5—Adolph J. Sabath, Chicago
6—Anton F. Maciejewski, Cicero
7—Leonard W. Schuetz, Chicago
8—Leo Kocialkowski, Chicago
9—Charles S. Dewey, Chicago
10—George A. Paddock, Evanston
11—Chauncey W. Reed, West Chicago
12—Noah Morgan Mason, Oglesby
13—Leo Elwood Allen, Galena
14—Anton J. Johnson, Macomb
15—Robert Bruce Chiperfield, Canton
16—Everett McKinley Dirksen, Pekin
17—Leslie C. Arends, Melvin
18—Jessie Sumner, Milford
19—William Howard Wheat, Rantoul
20—James M. Barnes, Jacksonville
21—Evan Howell, Springfield
22—Edwin Martin Schaefer, Belleville
23—Laurence F. Arnold, Newton
24—James Vandaveer Heidinger, Fairfield
25—Cecil William Bishop, Carterville

INDIANA

District 1—William Theodore Schulte, Hammond
2—Charles A. Halleck, Rensselaer
3—Robert A. Grant, South Bend
4—George W. Gillie, Fort Wayne
5—Forest Arthur Harness, Kokomo
6—Noble J. Johnson, Terre Haute
7—Gerald W. Landis, Linton
8—John William Boehne, Jr., Evansville
9—Earl Wilson, Huron
10—Raymond Smiley Springer, Connersville
11—William Henry Larrabee, New Palestine
12—Louis Leon Ludlow, Indianapolis

IOWA

District 1—Thomas Ellsworth Martin, Iowa City
2—William S. Jacobsen, Clinton
3—John W. Gwynne, Waterloo
4—Henry O. Talle, Decorah
5—Karl Miles LeCompte, Corydon
6—Paul Cunningham, Des Moines
7—Ben Franklin Jensen, Exira
8—Fred C. Gilchrist, Laurens
9—Vincent F. Harrington, Sioux City

KANSAS

District 1—William Purnell Lambertson, Fairview
2—Ulysses Samuel Guyer, Kansas City
3—Thomas D. Winter, Girard
4—Edward H. Rees, Emporia
5—John M. Houston, Wichita
6—Frank Carlson, Concordia
7—Clifford R. Hope, Garden City

KENTUCKY

District 1—Noble Jones Gregory, Mayfield
2—Beverly Mills Vincent, Brownsville
3—Emmet O'Neal, Louisville
4—Edward Wester Creal, Hodgenville
5—Brent Spence, Fort Thomas
6—Virgil Chapman, Paris
7—Andrew Jackson May, Prestonburg
8—Joe B. Bates, Greenup
9—John Marshall Robsion, Barbourville

LOUISIANA

District 1—F. Edward Herbert, New Orleans
2—Thomas Hale Boggs, New Orleans
3—James Domengeaux, Lafayette
4—Overton Brooks, Shreveport
5—Newt V. Mills, Monroe
6—Jared Y. Sanders, Jr., Baton Rouge
7—Vance Plauche, Lake Charles
8—A. Leonard Allen, Winnfield

MAINE

District 1—James Churchill Oliver, South Portland
2—Margaret Chase Smith, Skowhegan
3—Frank Fellows, Bangor

MARYLAND

District 1—David J. Ward, Salisbury
2—William Purington Cole, Jr., Towson
3—Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., Baltimore
4—John Ambrose Meyer, Baltimore
5—Lansdale G. Sasscer, Upper Marlboro
6—William Devereux Byron, Williamsport

MASSACHUSETTS

District 1—Allen Towner Treadway, Stockbridge
2—Charles Russell Clason, Springfield
3—Joseph E. Casey, Clinton
4—Pehr G. Holmes, Worcester
5—Edith Nourse Rogers, Lowell
6—George Joseph Bates, Salem
7—Lawrence J. Connery, Lynn
8—Arthur Daniel Healey, Somerville
9—Thomas Hopkinson Eliot, Cambridge
10—George Holden Tinkham, Boston
11—Thomas Aloysius Flaherty, Charlestown
12—John W. McCormack, Boston
13—Richard B. Wigglesworth, Milton
14—Joseph William Martin, Jr., North Attleboro
15—Charles L. Gifford, Cotuit (Barnstable)

MICHIGAN

District 1—Rudolph G. Tenerowicz, Detroit (Hamtramck)
2—Earl Cory Michener, Adrian
3—Paul Shafer, Battle Creek
4—Clare E. Hoffman, Allegan
5—Bartel J. Jonkman, Grand Rapids
6—William W. Blackney, Flint
7—Jesse Paine Wolcott, Port Huron
8—Fred L. Crawford, Saginaw
9—Albert J. Engel, Muskegon
10—Roy Orchard Woodruff, Bay City
11—Fred Bradley, Rogers City
12—Frank E. Hook, Ironwood
13—George D. O'Brien, Detroit
14—Louis Charles Rabaut, Detroit
15—John D. Dingell, Detroit
16—John Lesinski, Dearborn
17—George Anthony Dondero, Royal Oak

MINNESOTA

District 1—August Herman Andresen, Red Wing
2—Joseph Patrick O'Hara, Glencoe
3—Richard P. Gale, Mound
4—Melvin J. Maas, St. Paul
5—Oscar Youngdahl, Minneapolis
6—Harold Knutson, St. Cloud and Wadena
7—H. Carl Andersen, Tyler
8—William Alvin Pittenger, Duluth
9—Richard Thompson Buckler, Crookston

MISSISSIPPI

District 1—John Elliott Rankin, Tupelo
2—Wall Doxey, Holly Springs
3—William Madison Whittington, Greenwood
4—Aaron Lane Ford, Ackerman
5—Ross A. Collins, Meridian
6—William Meyers Colmer, Pascagoula
7—Dan R. McGehee, Meadville

MISSOURI

District 1—Milton Andrew Romjue, Macon
2—William L. Nelson, Columbia
3—Richard M. Duncan, St. Joseph
4—Charles Jasper Bell, Blue Springs
5—Joseph B. Shannon, Kansas City
6—Philip A. Bennett, Springfield
7—Dewey Short, Galena
8—Clyde Williams, Hillsboro
9—Clarence Cannon, Elsberry
10—Orville Zimmerman, Kennett
11—John B. Sullivan, St. Louis
12—Walter Christian Ploeser, St. Louis
13—John J. Cochran, St. Louis

MONTANA

District 1—Jeannette Rankin, Missoula
2—James Francis O'Connor, Livingston

NEBRASKA

District 1—Oren S. Copeland, Lincoln
2—Charles F. McLaughlin, Omaha
3—Karl Stefan, Norfolk
4—Carl T. Curtis, Minden
5—Harry Buffington Coffee, Chadron

NEVADA

At Large —James Graves Scrugham, Reno

NEW HAMPSHIRE

District 1—Arthur Byron Jenks, Manchester
2—Foster Stearns, Hancock

NEW JERSEY

District 1—Charles A. Wolverton, Camden
2—Elmer H. Wene, Vineland
3—William H. Sutphin, Matawan
4—D. Lane Powers, Trenton
5—Charles Aubrey Eaton, Watchung
6—Donald H. McLean, Elizabeth
7—J. Parnell Thomas, Allendale
8—Gordon Canfield, Paterson
9—Frank C. Osmers, Jr., Haworth
10—Fred A. Hartley, Jr., Kearny
11—Albert Lincoln Vreeland, East Orange
12—Robert Winthrop Kean, Livingston
13—Mary Teresa Norton, Jersey City
14—Edward J. Hart, Jersey City

NEW MEXICO

At Large —Clinton P. Anderson, Albuquerque

(Continued on Page 19)

(Continued from Page 18)

NEW YORK

At Large —Matthew J. Merritt, Malba, L. I., N. Y.
At Large —Caroline O'Day, Rye
District 1—Leonard W. Hall, Oyster Bay
2—William B. Barry, St. Albans
3—Joseph L. Pfeifer, Brooklyn
4—Thomas H. Cullen, Brooklyn
5—James J. Heffernan, Brooklyn
6—Andrew L. Somers, Brooklyn
7—John J. Delaney, Brooklyn
8—Donald L. O'Toole, Brooklyn
9—Eugene J. Keogh, Brooklyn
10—Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn
11—James A. O'Leary, West New Brighton, S. I.
12—Samuel Dickstein, New York City
13—Louis J. Capozzoli, New York City
14—M. Michael Edelstein, New York City
15—Michael Joseph Kennedy, New York City
16—William Townsend Pheiffer, New York City
17—Kenneth Farrand Simpson, New York City
18—Martin J. Kennedy, New York City
19—Sol Bloom, New York City
20—Vito Marcantonio, New York City
21—Joseph A. Gavagan, New York City
22—Walter A. Lynch, New York City
23—Charles A. Buckley, New York City
24—James M. Fitzpatrick, New York City
25—Ralph Abernethy Gamble, Larchmont
26—Hamilton Fish, Garrison
27—Lewis K. Rockefeller, Chatham
28—William Thomas Byrne, Loudonville
29—E. Harold Cluett, Troy
30—Frank Crowther, Schenectady
31—Clarence E. Kilburn, Malone
32—Francis D. Culkin, Oswego
33—Fred J. Douglas, Utica
34—Edwin Arthur Hall, Binghamton
35—Clarence E. Hancock, Syracuse
36—John Taber, Auburn
37—W. Sterling Cole, Bath
38—Joseph J. O'Brien, East Rochester
39—James Wadsworth, Geneseo
40—Walter Gresham Andrews, Buffalo
41—Alfred Florian Beiter, Buffalo and Williamsville
42—Pius L. Schwert, Buffalo
43—Daniel Alden Reed, Dunkirk

NORTH CAROLINA

District 1—Herbert Covington Bonner, Washington
2—John Hosea Kerr, Warrenton
3—Graham Arthur Barden, New Bern
4—Harold Dunbar Cooley, Nashville
5—Alonzo Dillard Folger, Mount Airy
6—Carl Thomas Durham, Chapel Hill
7—J. Bayard Clark, Fayetteville
8—William Olin Burgin, Lexington
9—Robert L. Doughton, Laurel Springs
10—A. L. Bulwinkle, Gastonia
11—Zebulon Weaver, Asheville

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large —Usher L. Burdick, Williston
At Large —Charles Raymond Robertson, Bismarck

OHIO

At Large —George H. Bender, Cleveland Heights
At Large —Stephen M. Young, Cleveland
District 1—Charles H. Elston, Cincinnati
2—William E. Hess, Cincinnati
3—Greg John Holbrock, Hamilton
4—Robert Franklin Jones, Lima
5—Cliff Clevenger, Bryan
6—Jacob E. Davis, Waverly
7—Clarence J. Brown, Blanchester
8—Frederick C. Smith, Marion
9—John F. Hunter, Toledo
10—Thomas A. Jenkins, Ironton
11—Harold K. Claypool, Chillicothe
12—John M. Vorys, Columbus
13—Albert David Baumhart, Jr., Vermilion
14—Dow W. Harter, Akron
15—Robert Thompson Secrest, Caldwell
16—William R. Thom, Canton
17—J. Harry McGregory, West Lafayette
18—Lawrence E. Imhoff, St. Clairsville
19—Michael Joseph Kirwan, Youngstown
20—Martin L. Sweeney, Cleveland
21—Robert Crosser, Cleveland
22—Frances P. Bolton, Lyndhurst, Cleveland

OKLAHOMA

At Large —Will Rogers, Oklahoma City
District 1—Wesley Ernest Disney, Tulsa
2—Jack Nichols, Eufaula
3—Wilburn Cartwright, McAlester
4—Lyle H. Boren, Seminole
5—A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma City
6—Jed Johnson, Anadarko
7—Sam C. Massingale, Cordell
8—Ross Rizley, Guymon

OREGON

District 1—James W. Mott, Salem
2—Walter Marcus Pierce, LaGrande
3—Homer D. Angell, Portland

PENNSYLVANIA

District 1—Leon Sacks, Philadelphia
2—James P. McGranery, Philadelphia
3—Michael J. Bradley, Philadelphia
4—John Edward Sheridan, Philadelphia
5—Francis R. Smith, Philadelphia
6—Francis John Myers, Philadelphia
7—Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Philadelphia
8—James Wolfenden, Upper Darby
9—Charles L. Gerlach, Allentown
10—J. Roland Kinzer, Lancaster
11—Patrick J. Boland, Scranton
12—J. Harold Flannery, Pittston
13—Ivor D. Fenton, Mahanoy City
14—Guy L. Moser, Douglassville
15—Albert G. Rutherford, Honesdale
16—Robert F. Rich, Woolrich
17—J. William Ditter, Ambler
18—Richard M. Simpson, Huntingdon
19—John Crain Kunkel, Harrisburg
20—Benjamin Jarrett, Farrell
21—Francis E. Walter, Easton
22—Harry L. Haines, Red Lion
23—James E. Van Zandt, Altoona
24—John Buell Snyder, Perryopolis
25—Charles I. Faddis, Waynesburg
26—Louis Edward Graham, Beaver
27—Harve Tibbot, Ebensburg
28—Augustine Bernard Kelley, Greensburg
29—Robert Lewis Rodgers, Erie
30—Thomas E. Scanlon, Pittsburgh
31—Samuel Arthur Weiss, Glassport
32—Herman Eberharter, Pittsburgh
33—Joseph McArdle, Pittsburgh
34—James Assion Wright, Carnegie

RHODE ISLAND

District 1—Aime J. Forand, Cumberland
2—John Edward Fogarty, Harmony

SOUTH CAROLINA

District 1—L. Mendel Rivers, North Charleston
2—Hampton Pitts Fulmer, Orangeburg
3—Butler B. Hare, Saluda
4—Joseph Raleigh Bryson, Greenville
5—James Prioleau Richards, Lancaster
6—John L. McMillan, Florence

SOUTH DAKOTA

District 1—Karl E. Mundt, Madison
2—Francis Case, Custer

TENNESSEE

District 1—Brazilla Carroll Reece, Johnson City
2—John Jennings, Jr., Knoxville
3—Estes Kefauver, Chattanooga
4—Albert Arnold Gore, Carthage
5—James Percy Priest, Nashville
6—Wirt Courtney, Franklin
7—Herron Pearson, Jackson
8—Jere Cooper, Dyersburg
9—Clifford Davis, Memphis

TEXAS

District 1—Wright Patman, Texarkana
2—Martin Dies, Orange
3—Lindley Beckworth, Gilmer
4—Sam Rayburn, Bonham
5—Hatton W. Sumners, Dallas
6—Luther A. Johnson, Corsicana
7—Nat Patton, Crockett
8—Albert Thomas, Houston
9—Joseph Jefferson Mansfield, Columbus
10—Lyndon Baines Johnson, Johnson City
11—William Robert Poage, Waco
12—Fritz Garland Lanham, Fort Worth
13—Ed Gossett, Wichita Falls
14—Richard M. Kleberg, Corpus Christi
15—Milton H. West, Brownsville
16—Robert Ewing Thomason, El Paso
17—Sam M. Russell, Stephenville
18—Eugene Worley, Shamrock
19—George H. Mahon, Colorado City
20—Paul J. Kilday, San Antonio
21—Charles L. South, Coleman

UTAH

District 1—Walter Kiel Granger, Cedar City
2—J. W. Robinson, Provo

VERMONT

At Large —Charles Albert Plumley, Northfield

VIRGINIA

District 1—Schuyler Otis Bland, Newport News
2—Colgate Whitehead Darden, Jr., Norfolk
3—Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., Richmond
4—Patrick Henry Drewry, Petersburg
5—Thomas G. Burch, Martinsville
6—Clifton Alexander Woodrum, Roanoke
7—A. Willis Robertson, Lexington
8—Howard Worth Smith, Alexandria
9—John W. Flannagan, Jr., Bristol

WASHINGTON

District 1—Warren G. Magnuson, Seattle
2—Henry Martin Jackson, Everett
3—Martin F. Smith, Hoquiam
4—Knute Hill, Prosser
5—Charles H. Leavy, Spokane
6—John Main Coffee, Tacoma

WEST VIRGINIA

District 1—Robert Lincoln Ramsay, Follansbee
2—Jennings Randolph, Elkins
3—Andrew Edmiston, Weston
4—George William Johnson, Parkersburg
5—John Kee, Bluefield
6—Joe L. Smith, Beckley

WISCONSIN

District 1—Stephen Bolles, Janesville
2—Harry Sauthoff, Madison
3—William Henry Stevenson, LaCrosse
4—Thad F. Wasielewski, Milwaukee
5—Lewis D. Thill, Milwaukee
6—Frank Bateman Keefe, Oshkosh
7—Reid F. Murray, Ogdensburg
8—Joshua Leroy Johns, Appleton
9—Merlin Hull, Black River Falls
10—B. J. Gehrmann, Mellen

WYOMING

At Large —John J. McIntyre, Douglas

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

The Lend-Lease Bill

WHAT'S your opinion concerning the lend-lease bill?

Presumably, you are either for it or against it.

How many informed Americans entertain the opinion that the lend-lease bill represents an ocean of diplomatic eye-wash? Not many.

It is our opinion — take it for what it's worth — that the lend-lease bill is not substantially concerned with lending or leasing or giving materials to Britain. It is concerned, however, with scuttling the last vestige of democracy in the world — American democracy.

Elsewhere in this edition we noted that Mr. Knudsen — who is authoritative — maintains that America will not be geared up to help England substantially before the closing months of 1942.

And by that date it is probable that there will be not much left of Great Britain.

It is our opinion that the master minds — whose philosophy and influence are regulating Mr. Roosevelt and his collaborators — are desirous of beating down the bulwarks of private ownership in America and of establishing a Marxian economy in our midst.

Too adroit to approach this objective directly, they have launched an indirect campaign to achieve their ends.

* * *

Class hatred was diligently stirred up at the outset.

A man-made depression was carefully continued for several years.

Labor strife was instigated on every front.

Vicious laws were enacted to inconvenience industry.

During all this time those responsible for all this knew, as did others, that war in Europe was inevitable.

While leftist bankers aided and abetted the growth and development of Hitlerism and the arming to the teeth of the Nazi party, they drugged the peoples of Poland, France, Belgium, Holland and England with propaganda so that these countries would become an easy prey to the wolf in sheep's clothing — Marxism.

Germany will win this war — mark these words. And Britain — despite all her sins and malefactions — will find herself governed by a group of Marxists who rode to power on the abuses of capitalism!

Meanwhile, America was not armed; was not prepared.

Meanwhile, the siren song of democracy was sounded in the ears of the deceived masses when those who were singing the song were intent upon scuttling democracy; were intent upon bringing about a condition that would require, on the face of it, all aid for Britain; really a condition, in the heart of it, which demanded the establishment of a dictatorship.

It is our opinion that many men at Washington are too realistic to presume that it is now possible to give all aid to Britain. It is too late.

These men fear the Frankenstein monster which was built under their noses.

They fear that labor, headed, in many instances, by radicals and protected now by Sidney Hillman — will swallow them up.

Therefore, the lend-lease bill — which will pass in one form or another. That is their "out."

Therefore, the scuttling of democracy under this guise of all aid for Britain. That is their refuge.

Therefore, the nationalization of industry. That is their compromise.

Therefore, the regimentation of citizens. That is their necessity.

Therefore, the centralized power of a vast nation condensed into the vest pocket of one man. That is their aim.

* * *

Let's look at this lend-lease bill for what it really is:

The lend-lease bill, we repeat, is the last and final effort to bury 1776 and its traditions.

The lend-lease bill is definitely a wolf in sheep's clothing. Its real name is the "dictatorship bill."

The lend-lease bill will substitute Karl Marx for George Washington.

And the lend-lease bill — we are pessimistic to believe — will be enacted into law one way or another before this time next year.

God save America!

Men, alone and unaided, cannot save her!

Complete List of Senators and Representatives Appears in This Issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine